





B 3 046 355





John Eustace Grubbe.





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CHURCH EXTENSION.

SUBSTANCE

OF

A S P E E C H

DELIVERED IN

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

On TUESDAY, the 30th JUNE, 1840.

BY

SIR ROBERT HARRY INGLIS, BART.

LONDON:

SOLD BY

J. HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY;

AND J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1840.

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

HENRY THE SEVENTH

BY JOHN HALLAM, ESQ.

OF LINCOLN'S INN

IN TWO VOLUMES

LONDON:

Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-Street Square.

S P E E C H.

OFTEN as I have addressed The House, I do not recollect that I have ever, except on one occasion, implored, or even asked, their attention. I have been content with such a hearing as, in the ordinary course of debate, they have been pleased (unasked) to give. The single occasion upon which, hitherto, so far as I recollect, I have ever implored that attention, was, when, two or three years ago, I endeavoured to bring before them the guilt and horrors of the Foreign Slave Trade ; and when, accordingly, I proposed an Address to The Crown for the purpose of extirpating that curse and crime. I gratefully acknowledge, that the patient hearing, which I then sought, was willingly conceded to me ; I still more gratefully add, that the House adopted that Address unanimously. Would to God, that the same result might attend my present appeal ! The motion, which I this day propose to The House, is one which has reference, chiefly, to the spiritual necessities, the fetters of vice and ignorance, in which our fellow-men are bound. The former motion had reference to those who were strangers to us, ex-

cept, indeed, so far as we are all brethren, children of one common Parent : the present motion has reference to those who are not only partakers of the same nature, but dwellers together in the same father-land, our fellow-subjects, and, in name at least, our fellow-Christians. My object, now, is to relieve not strangers, but our own countrymen ; not to rescue strangers, whom other strangers are enslaving and persecuting ; but to provide for the highest wants of our own people, to give to the perishing millions around us, in England itself, some of that light and some of that knowledge which are as essential to their well-being on earth, as to their well-being after death. I have said, indeed, that they are Christians by name, for such is every one born in a Christian country ; but, as I shall too well prove before I sit down, we live in the midst of an almost heathen population ; a population whom our neglect, and the neglect of our forefathers, has, in a manner, compelled to be heathen. On their behalf I implore the patient attention of The House.

Under what circumstances does the subject come before The House ? It is introduced to their notice by a body of petitions of a character which is pre-eminently entitled to consideration. The number of those petitions is 2546 ; the number of signatures is 213,580 : but it is not the number, either of the petitions or of the petitioners, to which I wish chiefly to direct the attention of The House. — Another circumstance connected with them is more worthy of notice. They come from every quarter

of the land, in all its length and breadth ; and from all classes. They come from remote country villages, where the parties, from their own personal experience of the blessings of religious worship and pastoral superintendence, desire that their fellow-countrymen, to whom these blessings have been denied, may share the privileges of happier districts. Several such I have presented. I will take one as an example. It is from Huntley, in Gloucestershire. I wish The House to hear the words of these humble petitioners. They state*, that they feel it to be a great blessing that they have the opportunity of meeting together at the church on the Sabbath day, to worship God, and to receive instruction in the way of duty and happiness ; and that they are the more sensible of this, as their own church has been recently enlarged, so as to give sufficient room for all the parishioners : — “ Your
 “ petitioners, therefore, hearing that a great many
 “ parishes are in want of church-room, and that the
 “ inhabitants, if they were able to obtain the mo-
 “ ney, would either build new churches or enlarge
 “ the old ones, humbly entreat that your Honour-
 “ able House would be pleased to take the subject
 “ into your consideration, and to adopt such mea-
 “ sures as may be sufficient to meet the wants of
 “ poor and unprovided parishes.” They feel the value of the church to themselves, and they only pray that others may have the same advantages. —

* Petition from Huntley, 27th Report on Public Petitions, p. 287.

Again, some petitions come from small well-conducted masses in the manufacturing districts, where the extent of the population has not yet outgrown the means of the church; and where, in consequence, the people, by being taught to know their own privileges, have a just sense of the wants of others. I hold in my hand the letter of the clergyman of Calverley, near Bradford, in Yorkshire, on transmitting to me one of the petitions which I have already presented: — “I am sorry,” he says, “that it is so late, and that the paper is so soiled; but it is the genuine petition of working clothiers in a small village, who left their looms to sign it.” — Again, other petitions which have loaded the table of this House, during the present Session, on this subject, have been sent up from those great towns, where the Christian sees and feels, almost in despair, the spiritual destitution of his poorer brethren. Such is the petition presented by my Noble Friend, the Member for North Lancashire (LORD STANLEY), from the immense parish of Whalley. Such is that presented by him from Manchester, the result of a great public meeting held there in the winter, and signed by more than ten thousand persons. Such is that presented by my Noble Friend, the Member for Liverpool (VISCOUNT SANDON), who has kindly undertaken to second the present motion; — a petition, excellent and powerful in itself, and, like that of Manchester, the result of a great public meeting. I may refer, in the same manner, to those from Birmingham; and to those, also, from Sheffield and from Leeds, which I have myself

presented. And here, let me add, that, in many of these large towns, immense sums have already been raised by voluntary effort, in furtherance of our present object ; but those sums, however large, are utterly inadequate to meet the growing wants even of those very towns ; —and it is now felt that nothing but national means can grapple successfully with that which is a national evil. —Again, other petitions are sent forth from great bodies of the clergy, assembled in their ecclesiastical meetings. My Hon. Friend, the Member for Wakefield (the Hon. WM. S. LASCELLES), presented a very important one, from the archdeacon and clergy of the archdeaconry of Craven, a district comprehending 700,000 souls. I have myself presented those of other archdeaconries, of Sarum, Salop, Dorset, Stafford, Ely, Exeter, and of many other bodies of the clergy, who have jointly taken into consideration these great wants of our country. The clergy of London, incorporated as the President and Fellows of Sion College, have felt it to be their duty, in like manner, to address this House, urging us to consider and relieve the spiritual destitution, not only of vast districts in other parts of the country, but of the very metropolis in which we are sitting. The venerable Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, at a public meeting, determined to appeal to this House for the same object, and honoured me by entrusting to me their petition. And, lastly, The House has heard the prayer of the two Universities ; that presented some time ago, from Cam-

bridge by my Right Hon. Friend near me (the Right Hon. H. GOULBURN), and that which I reserved to the last, among the 894 petitions committed to my charge, the petition of the Chancellor, Master, and Scholars of the University of Oxford, adopted unanimously in convocation. Let me add, that the petition of that University, addressed to The House last year, and adopted with the same unanimity, was the earliest expression of public opinion in favour of the great object which I now venture to submit to your notice.

And what is the general character of the prayer of all these petitioners? The tone, indeed, is different, but the substance is the same. They pray not to be relieved from a burthen, like the larger number of those, who, on other subjects, appeal to us : — not to be continued in the enjoyment of a privilege, or of a secular advantage, like other classes of petitioners : — not even for an abstract good, the attainment of which is to cost them nothing ; like the petitioners who have addressed us on behalf of the Dorsetshire labourers, or of John Thorogood : — but the parties, to whose petitions I am now referring, pray for a good to be purchased, as all men know, by a pecuniary and personal sacrifice which each man must be prepared to share. In this respect the petitions on the present subject differ from all other petitions which I remember ; excepting, always, those which covered the table three years ago in support of the system of church-rates, when the parties prayed for the continuance of that, which they knew, in-

deed, to be in one sense a burthen, but which, though a burthen, they felt to be at the same time a privilege. Those petitions were the most remarkable which, I believe, this House ever received. I make no exception in favour of those which implored us to abolish slavery in the colonies; because I am well aware that the vast majority of the parties who signed such petitions did not foresee that the emancipation of the slaves was to cost such a sum as twenty millions sterling; and that this sum was to be paid out of the taxes upon the people of England. Some, indeed, who foresaw the claim, distinctly denied its obligation. The character of the petitions now on the table is, therefore, all but unique.

The fact of petitions being presented is, indeed, the pre-requisite, which the Right Hon. Baronet, the Member for Nottingham (SIR JOHN C. HOBHOUSE), desired in 1824, as the condition of his vote, when the subject was last before the House. "Would the Right Hon. Gentleman say," (he referred to Mr. VANSITTART, now LORD BEXLEY), "that the grant was required by any call "on the part of the people of England for additional accommodation for the purposes of religious worship? There had been no such call. "There had not been a single petition presented "on the subject."* I claim the vote of the Right Hon. Baronet upon his own principles; as I shall hereafter show that I have a right to claim the votes of others, his colleagues, in virtue of other

* Hansard, vol. xi. New Series, p. 334, 9th April, 1824.

declarations which they have made. But I resume.

What do the petitioners ask? In different forms, but with one end and aim, they ask for all the people increased means of religious worship and public instruction in THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

On what grounds do they ask this? Summarily, on these:—That the fabrics of the existing churches were adapted to the small population of a distant age. Without entering into any antiquarian disquisition, I may assume that the average date of the erection of the parish churches now in England is about the middle of the reign of Edward the Third, the middle of the fourteenth century; at which time, the population of this country was probably under four millions.—That the population has outgrown the church-room. The population of England and Wales in 1700 was 5,475,000. It increased about a million in the first half of the last century; and it increased about two millions in the latter half. But from 1800 the very increase exceeds the whole population of the country as it existed in 1700. That increase has been more than six millions and a half; and there has been no adequate increase, there has scarcely been a measurable increase, in the means of public worship and instruction. It is obvious, therefore, at a glance, that accommodation sufficient for the wants of four millions must, taking numbers only into the account, though there are other important elements in the

consideration, be wholly incommensurate with the wants of sixteen millions.—That the evil of the existing disproportion between the numbers of the people and the means of The Church to receive them is increased by its being partial. The advance of the population has not been equable over England. In many rural districts it has not even yet outgrown the accommodation provided in the parish churches; but, in large towns, it has long fearfully predominated over all the means of pastoral care and instruction which The Church possessed. One third of the population is to be found in those towns, the population of which exceeds ten thousand; the population of almost all such towns having doubled in the present century; and scarcely any provision, none at all in proportion, having been anywhere made to meet the highest wants of these our fellow-creatures, or to infuse any light or any knowledge into the dark swelling masses around. Even in the metropolis, under the eyes of Parliament, what has been the case for the last century and a half? In 1712, Burnet describes two hundred thousand persons then in London as destitute of any means of public worship or instruction.* It formed the subject of

* Burnet's own Times, vol. ii. p. 58. edit. 1734.—“It being apparent that in the suburbs of London there were about 200,000 people more than could possibly worship God in the churches built there, upon a message to them (the House of Commons) from the Queen (to which the rise was given by an Address to Her from the Convocation), they voted that fifty more churches should be built; and laid the charge of it upon that part of the duty on coals that had been reserved for building of St. Paul's, which was now finished.”

parliamentary inquiry in this House, in 1711 : and the number then described in the Journals is still greater : — “ there will be about 342,000 (being “ two thirds of the whole number of souls), for “ whom no churches are as yet provided.”* We know the result : fifty new churches were ordered ; but I might almost state, that a generation passed away before even half the number were finished : the whole number were never begun. — That the evil of this excess of the population above the means of The Church is increased, not only by its being partial in respect to localities, but by its being inflicted, chiefly, if not exclusively, on the poorer classes. It is an evil specially affecting the poor. It is not merely an evil felt in Northamptonshire or Dorsetshire, in Lancashire or in Cheshire ; but wherever it is felt, it is felt by the poor, chiefly, or, I repeat it, almost exclusively.

* “ That upon the foot of this computation, 72 new churches would be requisite for the reception of those two thirds, if all of them were of the communion of the Church of England.

“ But the committee do compute that the number of French Protestants and Dissenters within the said parishes mentioned in the said scheme do amount to about 101,500, which being deducted out of 342,000, there will remain 240,500 of the communion of the Church of England, for whom no churches are provided.

“ Whereupon the committee came to the following resolution : —

“ Resolved, that it is the opinion of this committee, that in the several parishes in and about the suburbs of the cities of London and Westminster, 50 new churches are necessary to be erected for the reception of all such as are of the communion of the Church of England, computing 4750 souls to each church.” — *Journals*, 6th April, 1711.

The rich, who can pay for their accommodation, may support proprietary chapels ; but the poor, when excluded from their parish church, and deprived of those opportunities of public worship and religious instruction which The Church ought to be enabled to offer freely to all, can only look to those, whom the Providence of God has entrusted with the means, and to whom therefore He has committed the duty, of relieving such wants. I trust that they may not look in vain to this House.

“ It is a fearful experiment,” say the Liverpool petitioners, “ to try how large a portion of the people can be safely left without the pale of Christian institutions. And it is an act of the most grievous injustice, to resolve that such experiment shall be made at the cost of the poorer classes, who can do little to help themselves, and on whom penal measures, whenever necessary, are apt to fall with peculiar weight and severity.”

—As the University of Oxford, followed by other petitioners, state, — “ it belongs to the very essence of a national church, that her spiritual ministrations should be co-extensive with the spiritual wants of the whole community ; offered freely to all men, though not enforced upon any one :” that, notwithstanding this truth, “ a large proportion of the people are altogether excluded, without their consent or fault, from her public worship, religious instruction, and pastoral superintendence. That this spiritual destitution, which is ever least regarded by those to whom it is most pernicious, has chiefly befallen districts the

“least capable, even if they felt the want, of
 “supplying the remedy.” — The petition from the
 University of Oxford proceeds to state the social
 mischiefs hence arising; and adds, that the result
 is a national evil; and that “it ill becomes a great
 “and wealthy people to rest for the supply of a
 “national want either upon private liberality, or
 “upon the voluntary efforts of those poorer dis-
 “tricts in which the want especially prevails.”

The nation ought to enable The Church which it
 calls national, to offer its ministrations to all. Its
 duty is its interest. Wherever spiritual destitution
 prevails, there prevail, not only private vice and
 demoralisation, but political excesses and public tur-
 bulence,—in South Wales, in Monmouthshire, in
 the West Riding of Yorkshire. Wherever you find
 the absence of religious worship and instruction,
 there you find vice and evil; and wherever, on the
 contrary, you find a well-organised parish, with the
 legitimate influence of pastoral superintendence,
 there you will find, as a necessary consequence,
 the fruits of order, peace, and well-living.

The petitions which proceed from districts near
 the scene of the late insurrection in South Wales,
 (I refer particularly, to some petitions from Mon-
 mouthshire and Herefordshire,) distinctly specify
 the absence of religious instruction as the great
 source of political disorder as well as of private
 misconduct. And here let me also observe, that it
 is from the scenes of the late insurrection that the
 petitions, which, with one exception, have been the
 most numerous signed against my present motion,

have proceeded. It is a truth, never to be forgotten in the consideration of this subject, that those, who most need the instructions of religion, are themselves the least sensible of the want: and, in reference to this principle, it is worth remarking, that the numbers in the county of Monmouth, with its 100,000 souls, who have petitioned this House against any national extension of the national church, are greater, not only in proportion to the population, but absolutely, and, in fact, than in the four metropolitan counties, with their two millions and a half. When I talk of the numbers, who have signed what are called anti-church-extension petitions, I ought to add, what, indeed, may be the boast of some who present them, that they include persons of all religions;—I might, without uncharitableness, say, of all and of none.

I have now stated, summarily, the number of the petitions in favour of my motion; the difference, and distinctness, of the places and classes, whence they proceed: the peculiarity of their prayer, in asking that, the grant of which is to impose a pecuniary burthen upon themselves:—the ground of their prayer, arising from the facts, that the population has outgrown the church; that the want is greatest, where the masses of the people are the densest and the poorest; and that in consequence the people are demoralised, and the foundations of the public peace are shaken; independently of the far higher interests involved in the care of the souls of immortal myriads.

And what is the answer to those, who, on such grounds, petition this House to relieve the spiritual destitution of their fellow-countrymen? — I will endeavour to collect it fairly, — partly from the counter-petitions already on the table, and partly from speeches delivered here, or elsewhere, in reference to this and to kindred subjects.

We are told, then, that the State has no duty in the matter : — that the nation has no conscience : — that religion is an affair between God and the individual ; — and that the government of a country ought not to intermeddle with it : — that, accordingly, the State of England has not hitherto acted upon this alleged duty ; — [the amendment, which, in reference to the present motion, the Hon. Member for Kilkenny, (Mr. HUME,) has entered on the paper, begs Her Majesty to consider that the bulk of the property held by the Established Church consists of endowments made by various sovereigns and by “ other individuals :”] — that the State, as such, has not, with a few and late exceptions, built the existing churches : — that the State did not endow them ; that individuals had built them ; and individuals had endowed them : and it should be left to individuals to do the same now : — that the above being true, if all the people were of one mind, it becomes more palpably true, when it is known that a large proportion of the people (a petition, presented to-night by the Hon. Member for Kilkenny, stated, that the larger portion of the people of England were not members of the Esta-

blished Church * ; — another petition says, an overwhelming majority) are hostile to the Church. The ministers of the three denominations, I think, describe the Church as “a manifest minority;” and a petition †, which I recollect to have been presented by the Hon. Member for Lambeth (Mr. HAWES), in like manner, calls the Church “an unquestionable minority.” They go on to state that it is unjust to tax dissenters, being not only dissenters, but the majority of the people, for purposes which they do not require; and, far more unjust, to tax them for purposes, to which such “an overwhelming majority of the people are conscientiously opposed ‡;” — that it *not being the duty* of any government, in any case, and it being *unjust* in the actual case of England, to build and endow churches at the public expense, it is unnecessary, also, in consequence, first, of the enormous wealth of the Established Church, “the most amply endowed church on the face of the earth,” says one petition §; — “the richest in Christendom,” says another ||; the re-distribution of which wealth, or the better management of the sources of which,

* The Honourable Member himself stated, on the 11th of February, 1840, that one half of the people of England are dissenters.

† Reports on Public Petitions, 1840, p. 179.

‡ Reports on Public Petitions, 1840. Petition from Brether-ton, p. 258.

§ Reports on Public Petitions, 1840, p. 158. Petition from the Friends of Religious Freedom.

|| Reports on Public Petitions, 1840, p. 239. Petition from Exeter.

say many of the petitions, would supply all that could be needed; or, secondly, (even if this were not so,) in consequence of the “splendid achievements” of the voluntary principle, “in our own country, during the present age* :” by which splendid achievements it has been shown, how much people will do for the spiritual good of themselves; how much people will do for the spiritual good of others; how certainly religious instruction will be provided by the wise and rich for the ignorant and poor. At all events, say the political economists, the supply will always keep pace with the demand: it is of no use to force the market: if churches are wanted, (said the Hon. Member for Kilkenny, on a former occasion,) churches will be built. (Hear, hear, from Mr. HUME.) He cheers his own doctrine, now. — If churches are not wanted, they will not be filled.

I have endeavoured to state, briefly, and fairly, the sum of all the objections which I have heard, or read, against the present motion. They are directed, as the House will observe, against the means which I desire to employ in order to relieve a great and admitted evil: — the existence of that evil none deny; and few regard its extent to have been exaggerated. The importance, therefore, of the object I may assume as recognised, even by those who are prepared, on the grounds already stated, to resist the attainment of that object by the means which I propose.

* Petition from Stratford-on-Avon; Reports on Public Petitions, p. 254.

What is the answer to their first objection, their objection on the principle, namely, that the State has no conscience, and, therefore, has no duty in the matter? — My answer is, that, whether the State have, or have not, a conscience, [I will not pursue the subject as set forth in the remarkable and admirable book of my Hon. Friend the Member for Newark, Mr. W. E. GLADSTONE,] each individual has a conscience. All power is given by GOD to be used to His glory; to the advancement of His church; to the welfare of His people; and, especially, to the good of the poor in Christ. Influence is power. In every position of life, each man is bound to use all his power and all his influence, to promote these objects. Let no one, then, shelter himself under the delusion, that, though this might be true in private life, and though he might admit it in his own case while sitting in his own room, it ceased to be true when he was invested with power and influence as a legislator in this House. He carries his responsibility with him. He is bound every where to promote the glory of GOD, and the good of his fellow-creatures; and if to promote their temporal advantages, still more to care for their souls, and to provide for their spiritual destitution. I think, and trust, that few will rise up and deny the general proposition; and if all men who felt its truth, would act upon it, and would give their votes accordingly this night, the majority, which I might expect, would satisfy my warmest hopes; since, in truth, I hardly know where I could find

the minority. This is my answer to the first objection which has been urged elsewhere against my motion, and which is to be repeated, I presume, here to-night.

To the objection upon *principle*, succeeds the objection upon *precedent*: “the State of England has not hitherto discharged this alleged duty.” My reply is, that it is too late to urge such an objection. The State of England has built churches for the people, and has endowed those churches: the State has done just enough to overturn this argument, but not enough to fulfil its own duties to God and the people. I have already quoted from the journals the resolution of this House in 1711; and have alluded to the Act founded thereon for erecting fifty new Churches in the metropolis. However imperfectly the work was done, it recognised the principle that the nation was bound to provide for the people in a given district a church in proportion to their numbers; and to convey religious instruction to the nation through the means of the national Church. The same principle was recognised in certain Acts of King George the First. A long and sad neglect, the source of almost all our present evils, succeeded, extending through almost the whole reign even of King George the Third. At length, in the year 1809 (the first year of the administration of Mr. Perceval, a name which I can never mention without respect and gratitude), he recalled the attention of the country to their duty: and then commenced, and for eleven years continued, an annual

grant of a hundred thousand pounds, for the purpose of increasing the poorer livings of England, and thereby promoting the benefits of a resident pastoral superintendence of the people. Though, in the necessity, which I regret to feel, of trespassing largely upon the time of the House in endeavouring to bring this great subject justly before them, I am unwilling to read many extracts to them, I yet think myself justified in referring to this transaction in the eloquent language of a living prelate.*

“It is within the memory of many of us, that, for eleven years, the annual sum of one hundred thousand pounds was granted by Parliament towards endowing and augmenting poor benefices in populous places; and had it not been for this grant, the Forest of Dean, as well as some other parts of our own Diocese, instead of enjoying the pastoral ministrations of our Church for nearly twenty years, would have continued in a state little removed from Heathenism. I must add, that this measure was first adopted at a time when the public burthens pressed with a far heavier weight upon the community than they do at present; when the nation was engaged in a fearful and perilous contest; when the most gigantic power known in modern history was combined against our national independence, under a mighty conqueror, whose talents and ambition are hardly paralleled among the children of men. Yet at that time, when the argument for economy was far more cogent than at present, and when party heats and animosities were as great as at any other period, I find that this grant was decreed with the marked and unanimous approbation of all parties in the House of Commons.”

But I hasten on to other facts, which equally

* Bp. Monk's Charge, 1838, pp. 32, 33.

prove that I am not endeavouring to impose a new duty on the State of England; but merely re-urging an old and acknowledged, though imperfectly discharged, obligation. In 1818, the late Lord Liverpool, roused to the consideration of the subject by the celebrated work of the Rev. R. Yates, proposed the grant of a million in aid of the erection and endowment of churches and chapels in populous places. That grant passed in this House, without a division *, the Hon. Member for Kilkenny, then as now, being present. The same Minister proposed, for similar purposes, a grant of 500,000*l.* in the year 1824. That grant also, though not without discussion and divisions, passed both Houses of Parliament. Again, other aid was given in Scotland to relieve the spiritual destitution in its Highlands and Islands. Now, though all your exertions have utterly failed to overtake the march of population, though, after all, you have not provided for more than 1 in 20, even of the increase in your numbers, since the commencement of those exertions†, you have at least, in them, and by them, recognised the principle, that it is the duty of the nation to provide for those who cannot otherwise obtain *it, the blessing of the means of religious worship and public instruction.

I turn to another objection; — to the objection

* The only division was on a clause which Sir William Scott proposed to expunge from the Bill; and which was expunged accordingly. — *Hansard*, vol. xxxviii. p. 426.

† Petition from Standon; Reports on Public Petitions, p. 59.

founded on the alleged fact, that those who dissent from the Church, are “the overwhelming majority of the people ;” and that, therefore, it is most unjust to tax them in support of the religion of the minority. On the value of numbers as a test of truth, I will not enter ; nor, at this moment, on the duty of a State, in respect to its own estimate of truth, irrespective of numbers altogether. But, as the argument from the numbers of those who dissent from the Church, is very prominent in their own petitions, and in the speeches of their advocates, and forms what is sometimes called a reason, and is always very like a threat, I will endeavour to prove to the House, that this alleged fact is grossly mis-stated. I admit that the dissenters are noisy enough, if that would prove their numbers ; but, statistically, I deny the fact.

It is very true, that there is no actual census of the kingdom, according to religious denominations. It is equally true, that there is not even a return of their respective places of worship. I endeavoured last year, and do not abandon the attempt, to ascertain that point more accurately : but, at present, the number of dissenters is, I admit, to be collected not by actual returns, either of the population as such, or even of their places of worship : but, inferentially only, from a deduction of various particulars. First, from the number of their chapels : the noble Lord opposite (LORD J. RUSSELL) stated last year, on the 12th of February, 1839, that the number of their chapels in England and Wales was about 10,000. The hon. and learned Member for

the City of Dublin (Mr. O'CONNELL) in a paper, which I hold in my hand, bearing his signature, and sent, I presume, to every other member as well as to me, states that the number of Roman Catholic AND dissenting chapels in England and Wales is 9000. The only Parliamentary return, I believe, on this subject is one moved for in 1836, by my noble friend, the member for the City of Durham (VISCOUNT DUNGANNON), then Mr. ARTHUR TREVOR.* The total number in that return, deducting London, is 26,260. But the House should recollect that Mr. ARTHUR TREVOR's return gives not merely chapels, but licensed rooms;—and not only those existing in use at its date, but those, in respect to which a license was ever granted; there being no return made to any office, shewing that any place, so licensed, as a place of worship, was either continued, or discontinued as such. In the diocese of Ely, the return includes all places licensed during the hundred years, from 1736 to 1836: in Warwickshire, and, I think, some other places, all from the Revolution of 1689 downwards. Then as to the proportion of those still used, the Leicester return, which gives 312 as the number licensed for dissenting worship since 1812, states, that less than one third are now so used: the Ely return states, that, in that diocese, not above one fifteenth (of the number 349) are probably now used for the purposes for which they were registered.

Secondly, I draw a conclusion as to the number of dissenters in England and Wales, from the quality

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 443. of Session 1836.

of the places, in respect to which licenses for public worship have been asked and obtained ; whether such places are, or are not, at this moment used as such. Several of the reports included in Mr. ARTHUR TREVOR's return, state, that the larger number included as licensed are not distinct buildings or meeting houses, but "rooms in private houses," * — "barns, stables, shops, or places of any other kind." † — "A summer house in a garden belonging to the dwelling-house of John Hunt, in St. John Sepulchre (now the Ebenezer Chapel)." — "John Golden, a room in his dwelling house in Pockthorpe, opposite the Jolly Sportsman." ‡ The Axbridge return specifies "one dwelling house licensed 'Baptist Meeting;' and, also, licensed to sell Beer, &c., by retail." § I mention this not to cast ridicule on the individuals ; but, for self-defence, to resist the inference which is drawn from the mere list of dissenting places of worship, as shewing alike the activity and the numbers of their congregations, in opposition to the Church. I again deny their superior numbers ; and the argument which they found upon it.

Even where their places of worship are distinct buildings, exclusively appropriated as such, the numerical preponderance of dissenters over The Church cannot be sustained by any argument founded on the size of such chapels or meeting-houses. Even in London, they do not give more

* Do. Bristol, p. 38. Carlisle, p. 38. † Do. Norfolk, p. 6.

‡ Do. Norwich, p. 27.

§ Do. Axbridge, p. 12.

than an average of 500 sittings* : or 631, according to a writer in the *Congregational Magazine*† : and the aggregate number of sittings as claimed by the same authority for the metropolis and its environs is only 257,658. But such an average would, I think, be greatly too high. In Maitland's able work on the *Voluntary System*‡, I find transcribed five advertisements of dissenting chapels on sale : they are in the outskirts of London ; and I find the average is only 300. In Lambeth, indeed, the Independents lay claim to 700 ; and the Baptists, to 500 sittings in each chapel. But the general average must be taken from the surface of the whole country. In Lancashire, according to the returns of 1831, to which I shall presently advert more particularly, the average is 432. What, however, said Dr. Bowring§, — in a debate in this House, continued for some time, and in which many leading members took a part, when there was no motive to extend the number of worshippers attached to dissenting chapels ? — [It was on a clause in the Marriage Bill requiring twenty householders to certify that they desired that their chapel might be registered as a place for the solemnisation of marriages :] — He resisted the clause, and divided the House, on the ground that “there are some “hundreds of dissenting places of worship which “have been in existence for several generations,

* Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel's Letter to Viscount Melbourne, 1839, p. 8. † p. 845. ‡ Maitland, p. 22—25.

§ Mirror of Parliament, 13th June, 1836, p. 1878.

“ among the congregations of which it would not
“ be possible to find twenty householders.”

The statement of the great number of the dissenters in England is further disproved, or, at least, impugned—1. by the number of their contributors, and, 2. by the amount of their contributions, to objects purely benevolent; I mean, of course, to such as are not directly connected with the diffusion of worship or instruction. Take, for example, an infirmary or hospital. Take the number of contributors, Churchmen and dissenters, to an infirmary*:—

* In Wiltshire, the Churchmen are 16 to 1 dissenter.				
In Gloucester	-	-	-	30 to 1 543 to 18.
In Durham	-	-	above 15 to 1	161 to 11.
In Exeter	-	-	above 12 to 1	645 to 51.
In Bedford	-	-	-	15 to 1.

In Leeds, [I see the Hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. BAINES) opposite; he will correct me, if I mis-state the fact; the proportion is more in favour of the dissenters there than in the other places which I have quoted]—in Leeds, the Churchmen do not outnumber the dissenters, as contributors to the infirmary, in a greater proportion than as being rather more than three fourths of the whole. Again,

* Letter to Sir R. H. Inglis, by the Rev. Edw. Edwards, p. 8—10. The Statistics are taken chiefly from the British Magazine of 1834. Charge of the Rev. W. Dealtry, Chancellor of Winchester, 1834, p. 94, 95. The Charge is excellent; and the notes contain a large and valuable mass of statistical and general information.

take the amount of contributions, as well as the number of contributors. Why, in the cathedral of Salisbury alone, more was raised for the County Infirmary in one day, than in all the dissenting chapels throughout the county. “The funds being
 “deficient, a collection was made on the Fast-day
 “throughout the county, in most of the churches,
 “after the morning service only; and in the dissenting chapels generally, after the morning and
 “evening service. The result was :

	L.	s.	d.
“ Collected at the cathedral	-	79	19 8
“ Different churches	-	1124	6 6
“ Dissenting chapels	-	73	18 11”*

I say, either the dissenters have exaggerated their numbers, or their benevolence is not in proportion to their numbers.

[AN HON. MEMBER : “ But the dissenters are poorer.”]

Be it so. The distinction which I have just pointed out may be called an aristocratic and invidious test of their numbers ; numbers being the sole point at issue. But I think that I have an answer to the Hon. Gentleman who has made the observation : I can give him a less objectionable test of the number of those who dissent from the Church. In all England, according to returns, which the House granted on my motion two years ago, the whole number of marriages *solemnised* — though that is not the word to be applied to any unions con-

* Dealtry’s Charge, 1834, p. 95.

tracted without the least reference to God, or his word —

[Mr. HAWES. “ Oh, oh ! ”]

Does the Hon. Member for Lambeth mean that a marriage contracted before a registrar has any the least reference to God, or His word? Is it not purposely, avowedly, and by privilege, a purely civil contract, like any bargain and sale? And such marriages are some of those included in the returns, which I was about to quote, of marriages — the whole number performed and celebrated without the services of the Church, was 4088; whereas, in London alone, within the Bills of Mortality, the number solemnised according to the rites of the Church, in exactly the same period of time, was 6032. And now I defy you to resist my conclusion; either the dissenters exaggerate their numbers now, or they exaggerated their grievances, when, three or four years ago, they prevailed on this House, in deference to the scruples of conscience which they urged, to recognise as valid a marriage without the sanctions of religion; and for the first time in the history of England, except only in the days of the Great Rebellion, to separate from the chief tie of human society any reference to the blessing of ALMIGHTY GOD.

I have, however, another and more direct proof that the dissenters do not form the majority, or any thing like the majority, of the people of England and Wales, however great their noise and activity may be, in proportion to their numbers. Some years ago, the Hon. and Learned Member for

the City of Dublin (Mr. O'CONNELL) moved for certain returns, connected with the religious statistics of the country. Each denomination of dissent was returned by its own minister ; and the priests of the Church of Rome returned the numbers of their flocks. Unhappily, all these returns perished in the fire of 1834. Happily, however, one of them had been already printed. It is the return for Lancashire. Why it was selected for printing I cannot, of course, state : possibly, it was thought to be the most favourable for the object, in reference to which all were moved for. I am content with it. I must observe, that above one eleventh of the county of Lancaster made no return. Now, out of a population at that time stated to consist of 1,052,859, what was the amount claimed by the Church of Rome — recollect in Lancashire — and by all sects dissenting from the Church of England, conjointly ? The number returned was only 255,411 ; add to this the same proportion, out of the parishes making no return, which is found in the others ; add, accordingly, 26,478 ; and you obtain a total claimed as belonging to others, and not to the Church, a total of 281,889 ; nothing like a third, though exceeding a fourth, in this county, in which pre-eminently, if any where in England, it might have been supposed that those who differed from the Church of England might have claimed and formed the majority. Now, I appeal to the Hon. Gentlemen opposite, if you admit that the remainder not claimed by you belong to the Church, this shows the manifest minority of those who do not belong to the Church ; and, there-

fore, destroys your own argument from your alleged majority of numbers. If, on the other hand, you reply, that they do not belong to the Church, inasmuch as they have no religion at all, you prove my case and justify my motion, more conclusively than by any other argument, inasmuch as you prove the urgent and overwhelming want of the means of increased religious instruction and worship. You cannot escape from this dilemma. Either the Church of the State comprehends the overwhelming majority of the people, and, in that case, by every rule of government, the State must act on its own sense of duty without reference to the opposition of a minority: or all your own voluntary efforts, and all the authorised instructions of the Church, have alike proved lamentably and hopelessly inadequate to meet the wants of the people; and frightful masses of ignorance and irreligion have been left, which no means hitherto applied have been sufficient to enlighten. You cannot escape from the alternative.

One more observation on this subject: — There is an authority which you highly value on political economy. Will you take his opinion as to the number of dissenters in England and Wales? Mr. M'Culloch says, that the number, including Roman Catholics, is 2,700,000, or, at most, 3,000,000; or, deducting Roman Catholics, whom he reckons at 500,000, he gives 2,500,000 as the aggregate of Protestant dissenters.

I have pursued this subject of numbers perhaps too far; but I know how much, on this and on other questions, an appeal to numbers is a favourite

and too powerful an argument ; and I felt it to be my duty to deny the fact, and to show to the House that I did not lightly deny it. I trust, indeed, that I have sufficiently shown that, whatever be the present fate of my motion, the claim of the dissenters of England to decide the question, because they are the overwhelming majority of the people, and the Church an unquestionable minority, will not, in this House at least, be again urged.

What is a government, if the will of a minority be allowed to oppose itself successfully to the will of the majority ; and to the actual law, embodying that will ? The tastes, the wants, and even the conscience of an individual (I know the force of that word “conscience,” and will revert to it), are not to be the measure of his obedience to a municipal law. As to tastes and wants, how many in every country pay for roads, bridges, (and gaols too, happily,) which they never use ? How many pay for policemen for whom they never send. A man, indignant at the demand of a police-tax, as I find the story in a note to my friend Dr. Dealtry’s Charge*, exclaimed, “I never sent for a policeman in my life.” “Neither did I,” was the reply ; “but yet I pay willingly, because it prevents the necessity of my sending for one.” How much was paid by the people of England for the Caledonian Canal ? How much has been paid by all the home subjects of the Crown for the Rideau Canal ? Do I blame the expenditure on either head ? No : I refer to

* Dealtry’s Charge, 1834, notes, p. 66.

them only to show that the doctrine,—that no man is to pay for that which he does not distinctly and individually require,—is destructive of all government. ✓

I advert for a moment to another expense—in some degree connected with religion, and, consequently, with conscience,—which the demands of the dissenters, chiefly, brought upon the country, but which, as involving mere expense, none of us have ever resisted; I mean, the whim, if it were not worse, of registering births, and, thereby, so far as it went, tending to supersede the sense of the obligation of baptism, by superseding the necessity of its registry. What is the cost of this new system of the Registration of Births? and how much of that cost is Churchmen's money? We objected to the principle; but, being defeated, we submit to the payment.

A more stirring subject remains: I refer to the great question of National Education. A large body of the people of England opposed the Government measure last year on the subject. This House was divided upon it; one of the largest minorities ever known, consisting of 300 members, on conscientious grounds, opposed the grant. Those who felt with them, and who formed the majority in the other House of Parliament, induced that House to address The Queen upon the subject. Public bodies petitioned the Crown. But in this House the ministers had a majority of 2. Did they recognise the rights of conscience in the minority? Did they respect their scruples? Did they not say in substance, "You have nothing to

do with taxes but to pay them, and with laws but to obey them ? ”

I am, therefore, entitled on every ground to state, that the essential function of a government is destroyed, if it do not enforce its own will upon all its subjects. The supreme power of a State may be in the hands of one, or in the hands of many ; but, wherever it is lodged, it must have this right. If it were to yield to a large minority, it must, on the same principle, yield to a smaller ; it must yield to ten, or to two individuals, if their conscience were to be admitted as the measure of their obedience. But is conscience to be allowed to be a plea for every thing ? — Are Quakers, in England, permitted to escape payment of war-taxes ? Is there any hon. Gentleman opposite who will tell me, that conscience is an excuse for every thing ? Is there not something above conscience ? is conscience always enlightened ? Has not GOD enabled us to try our conscience by His word and truth ? Did not those, who thought that they were doing GOD service, commit nevertheless, what every one of us admits to be, a great crime ? And always when we plead conscience, let us be quite sure, that our conscience is in our hearts, and not in our pockets.

A reference has been made to what I said on a former occasion on the question of conscience. I then said, and I now repeat, that I will never voluntarily give sixpence for teaching as the word of God, that which I believe not to be the word of God. To that principle I adhere : but though I

will give nothing, I will pay every thing which the law of my own country requires me to pay. I stated before, and I state now, that every supreme authority has the right to establish any form of public worship which it thinks proper. I stated before that [I conceded the same right to the Sultan at Constantinople, which I claim for the supreme power of England. I hold the Sultan to be at perfect liberty to impose a tax upon all the property in his empire for the maintenance of Islam, and of the mosques of Islam ; and if I had land in Turkey, my course would be clear, namely, to pay the tax, or to leave the country. If, indeed, the imposition were personal ; if the act required were personal ; if a heathen emperor required me to sacrifice to Jupiter, I know what my duty would be ; though I know, also, that God only could give me grace and strength to discharge it ; but in the present case, in the case of a tax to build churches in England, no man is taxed as a dissenter or a Roman Catholic, but as a subject ; and in proportion to his wealth, and not in reference to his creed. The tax is laid not upon persons, but upon property ; not upon dissenters as such, but upon an acre, or on a house, which, by whomsoever cultivated, or occupied, would always pay exactly the same sum.

As a general principle, observe, too, that the law of England does not presume dissent ; the constitution of England does not presume dissent ; the writ of summons does not presume dissent : on the contrary, the Parliament is summoned, in consent and sympathy, to consult for the good of the

realm and of the Church; *de arduis negotiis Regni et Ecclesiæ* : and, at this moment, the great body of this House, five hundred members still, are members of the Church of England. I have already stated my belief, and my reasons for the belief, that the great body also of the people of England, whom we represent, are themselves members of the Church.

Then, as to the objection which is urged against my present motion, from the argument — “that the wealth of the Church is enormous, and might supply all the need of all the people” — I reply, that the wealth of the Church, as actually levied to-day, is not enormous. What the wealth of the Church might have been, if all had remained with it, it is not easy to say. I remember that Warner, in his “Western Counties,” states, that the aggregate income of the estates of the Abbey of Glastonbury, if kept together to his day, at the end of the last century, would then have been about 500,000*l.* per annum. But two thirds of the ecclesiastical revenues of England were transferred to the Crown or to lay subjects at the Reformation; and the remainder furnishes a scanty income to many; and if it were equally divided among all, would scarcely furnish a decent provision for any. At this time, the income of 3528 livings of England is under 150*l.* and some vicarages are under 5*l.* per ann.* The average of all the livings of England is only 24*l.*; while even the Honourable Member opposite (Mr.

* Glover’s Queen Anne’s Bounty. He mentions one vicarage of 2*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* — p. 50.

HUME) admitted, when we were discussing, a few years ago, the case of the Irish clergy, with a view to a better provision for them, that the income of none ought to be less than 300*l*. The aggregate income of all the Prelacy of England, if all were thrown into the funds of the parochial clergy, would not add a sum of 16*l*. per ann. to each of the livings in England. The whole amount of all ecclesiastical property in England and Wales, divided among the fifteen or sixteen thousand priests of The Church, is not 3,500,000*l*. per annum. It is very true, that this aggregate is very unequally divided. I, for one, do not object to the inequality. On principle, I see reason to prefer it: but those who object to it must recollect, that the advowsons of one third of all the livings of England are in lay hands; and that the richest livings in England, Doddington, for instance (an estate bill in reference to which parish is now passing through this House), and Winwick, are, as advowsons, quite as much the property of laymen as their manors or broad lands. Other livings, large and small, are daily bought and sold in the market; an abuse, if you please; and I cordially admit it; but an abuse sanctioned by the law for three centuries, and not to be corrected at the expense of private property, without giving compensation to the holders. If, without giving compensation to the holder of the advowson of a large living so purchased in the market, you take a certain proportion from the income of that large living in order to give it to a small living, which, like the

other, has been openly purchased in the market, you violate the security upon which any man holds any property : if, on the other hand, you give, as you are bound to give, a just compensation, the nation is paying, and is therefore taxed, as much as it would be paying and would be taxed, in order to secure that increase in the number of churches, ministers, and parochial districts, which it is the object of my motion to supply.

What I have last submitted to the House, is, in part, an answer to the objection — “ distribute
 “ better the wealth of the Church, and you meet the
 “ spiritual destitution of which you complain : ” but the objection refers, also, to a new and distinct management of the sources of that wealth ; — “ by a different management more might be raised — enough
 “ for all spiritual purposes might be raised, — without taxing the people of England.” It is impossible on this occasion to enter fully into the question of church-leases; the object here pointed at. It is enough to say, that, admitting the assumption that much more might be raised in the shape of rent from a given property by changing its tenure, as has been proposed in the matter of church-leases, such change implies not merely taking away from landlords as legal holders of property their management of such property, (this, in the case actually before you, you would not much mind,) but also, taking away from tenants their beneficial interest in such tenures, which, I believe, some of you would much mind.

After all, the Church, meaning, thereby, as you

mean, ecclesiastical bodies, aggregate or sole, has, as distinct from other Christians, no duty and no interest in Church-extension. Do you tax the Generals for barracks, or the Judges for Gaols? Tax the Clergy, as you tax others, *in aid*, but do not tax them exclusively, and as a class. Yet we have been told, even by a Bishop,—“wait, before “you apply to Parliament for assistance in this matter “—wait, till it is seen what the Church will do.” In the first place, The Church is not a body of ecclesiastics, but of all faithful men. In the next place, what is the duty of Durham to provide the means of Church-extension in Monmouthshire? The principle, at the very utmost, must be limited to the claim which poverty has upon property, and to the correlative duty which property owes to poverty; and will, therefore, go no farther than to require Durham, for instance, to provide for Durham, and to authorise you to re-distribute the ecclesiastical income of the chapter of Durham over the parishes whence it arises. Church-reform is the object of the Bill, to which I am now alluding; Church-extension is the object of my motion. They are not only not necessarily connected, but there is no connexion at all in principle; and, as to the practical effect of Church-reform, I have already stated that the annihilation of the whole Prelacy of England would only add 16*l. per annum*, to each living. The purport of the Bill before the House, the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill, is the augmentation of small livings already existing:

Church-extension has reference to new fabrics, new endowments, new parochial districts.

But it is said, that any such National grant, and, consequently, any such taxation, is unnecessary, in consequence of “the glorious triumphs,” “the splendid achievements,” of the voluntary principle.

Now, in the first place, I do not deny the value of the voluntary principle, or its efficiency in the infancy of the Church. I admit that in the first and earliest age it furnished the support of the Christian Church, though it never furnished the support of God’s earlier church under the elder dispensation. Every one knows, that, under the Jewish economy, though there were free-will offerings, there were also, in regular succession, not only tithes, but other payments, in money, and in kind. And though, in the first day of The Church, when Apostles received the gifts of the people, and could, at the same moment, discern their thoughts and hearts, and could, accordingly, discriminate between a Barnabas, who having land, sold it and brought the money and laid it at their feet, and an Ananias who, professing to do the same, kept back part of the price of his possession, The Church might well rely on support so given, and so received; yet, when this power ceased, and when men were left to the ordinary operation of human motives and human control, and when men were settled in Christian communities, — fixed oblations, and, at no distant time, tithes and yearly dues became the stated and regular support of the Church. Unless, then, you can return to the days of the Apostles,

with their power, also, the analogy is futile, as proving that the voluntary principle is all-sufficient. I admit, however, that, in this and in every age, it ought to be invoked in aid. But I contend that, in no age, and in no country, since the days of the Apostles, has it ever been tried, as, in itself, all-sufficient for the support and maintenance of religion, except in the single instance of the United States of America. You can produce no other instance from the first age to the Reformation, and none from the Reformation to this day. Now, how has this principle worked in the United States? Has it, in the first place, provided a minister for every church? I take the word *Church* as I find it in their own returns, meaning not always, I believe, a fabric, but a congregation. Now, by those returns, there are, within the Confederation, 15,000 churches; there are, of all denominations, 10,800 ministers, leaving unprovided for, 4200 churches. How are these churches situated? over an area of 636,000 square miles. And when you are considering the adequacy of this supply, recollect that the area to be covered by it is about twelve times the area of England; and, then, judge, whether the voluntary principle has been safely entrusted with the spiritual charge of such a continent? I might ask, how are the ministers paid; and, above all, how are the people taught? I mean, excepting in the case of the older Eastern states, where, in many cases, endowments made before the Revolution are retained, and where an old established parochial system is

traced, so far as the Episcopal framework subsists. But, on the general view of the larger part of the States, I will compress all which I desire to say, as conveying the effect and working of the whole system, in the words of a late traveller, the Rev. Samuel J. Mills.*

“Never will the impression be erased from my heart, that has been made by beholding those scenes of wide-spreading desolation—The whole country, from Lake Erie to the Gulph of Mexico, is as the valley of the shadow of death. Darkness rests upon it. Only here and there a few rays of Gospel light pierce through the awful gloom. This vast country contains more than a million of inhabitants. Their number is every year increased by a mighty flood of emigration. Soon they will be as the sands on the sea shore for multitude. Yet there are at present little more than 100 Presbyterian or Congregational Ministers in it. Were these Ministers equally distributed throughout the country, there would be only one to every 10,000 people. But now there are districts of country containing from twenty to fifty thousand inhabitants entirely destitute. And how shall they hear without a preacher?”

I am justified, then, I think, in asserting that the voluntary principle, in the only instance, America, in which it has been tried nationally, has signally and fatally failed. It has failed in England also,—both among dissenters and Churchmen. Among dissenters, it has failed, whether we look to the supply of ministers, to the provision for such ministers, or even to the erection of chapels. Abundant evidence on all these points may be found in Maitland’s important work on the

* Chalmers’s Works, vol. xvii. p. 180, 181.

Voluntary System. I will only add two observations on the subject: — first, many of the meeting-houses of dissent are notoriously built on speculation, and, systematically, on debt: secondly, they may be built any where, and without any restriction, civil or religious, without the control of any Priest, Bishop, or Magistrate. We know how different is the law, and how different is the fact, in reference to the multiplication of the edifices of Church worship. Again, a dissenting chapel, if it fail as such, may at once be converted to any other use. Yet, with all these facilities, how inadequate, by their own admission, has been the supply of divine worship under the voluntary system, to the dark places of this land!

I admit, as freely, that the voluntary principle has failed in England among Churchmen, not less than among dissenters; while again I say, I would always invoke it *in aid*, though it is utterly inadequate to supply exclusively a national want. For instance, in this very metropolis, in London, in the richest city of the world, its diocesan, whose zeal and whose energy are above all the praise which I could offer, and whom I am permitted to call my friend, appealed four or five years ago, to the wealthy and the great around him, and told them, that, looking to the spiritual destitution of their neighbours, inhabitants of the same city with themselves, 379 new churches at least were required to give the means of public worship and instruction in the Establishment, to those who had a right to expect them, by whomsoever to be fur-

nished. But looking also in some degree to the means of worship elsewhere given, though in no degree approaching, even numerically, to an adequate supply—on the contrary, falling in every way short of it, and despairing, certainly, of succeeding to the full extent of his own wishes, which would only have been limited by the wants of his people,—the Bishop of London, our diocesan here, asked for the means of building and scantily endowing no more than 50 Churches ; he asked for 250,000*l*. In this centre of riches, did he obtain this? He obtained scarcely more than half ; till an individual arose, whom also I feel it an honour to call my friend, Mr. William Cotton, who, with energy equal to the occasion, instituted a subscription to relieve the spiritual destitution of one great and neglected locality in the Metropolis, Bethnal Green. He asked for 70,000*l*. to build and endow ten new Churches in that parish. Thank God, he has already obtained 45,000*l*.; and these Churches, added to those raised by the Bishop's Fund, will probably extend the whole number to forty. But even this, the utmost success which can be anticipated, proves only the utter inadequacy of the voluntary system, under the most favourable circumstances, to supply the wants of a nation.

I mention with pleasure other instances of active voluntary exertion in the endeavour to provide free means of worship for the poor. I will begin with a remarkable case of self-denying labour and sacrifice, on the part of a clergyman in a distant part of the country, whom, individually, I do not

know ; but a memorial from whom to Earl Grey I hold in my hand. I refer to the Rev. Hammond Roberson, of Yorkshire. He states,—

“ The income of your Memorialist, as a clergyman, for *fifteen* years, during which he was regularly employed in the Church, had not averaged *forty pounds* a year. He had neither patrimony nor prospects. He had a taste for education, and devoted himself thereto; but not so as to forget the sacred obligations of his ordination. The neglected state of Liversedge greatly affected his feelings.

“ In 1802 he purchased five acres and a quarter of land as a probable site for a Church and appendages. In 1812, being left without any family engagements, he began to build a Church upon what he considered the best possible security—an act of the British Parliament. In 1816 a Church was consecrated in Liversedge; and, so far as your Memorialist knows, became part and parcel of the National Church Establishment in these realms; with a hundred free sittings for the poor of the township, an acre of ground well fenced in for a cemetery, a right to the inhabitants to marry, baptize, bury, and register; and to have the doctrines, services, and sacraments of Christ, ‘as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church and realm hath received the same,’ as fully, regularly, and duly administered, as in any Parish Church in the realm,—and under the same jurisdiction; with four acres of land for the use of the Incumbent.”

Perhaps there is no other instance of a Church built by the voluntary efforts of a single clergyman who drew no higher income from the ecclesiastical revenue of the country than *40l. per annum*. But in other classes, also, there are honourable instances of those who have felt it to be their duty to bestow a portion of their wealth in promoting the means of church-worship amongst their dependents.

I find in the late Mr. Yates's memorable work* the following reference to the Earl of Lonsdale:—

“ An instance of this truly patriotic and benevolent regard to the best interests of the State and of humanity has fallen under my own knowledge, in the example afforded by your Lordship's noble and estimable friend, to whose liberality the counties of Cumberland and Westmorland have recently been so much indebted; and who, by rebuilding and repairing decayed Churches and Village Chapels upon several parts of his estates, has judiciously and charitably evinced his own respect to the Christian duties, by enabling others to perform them also: and by liberal grants of lands and tithes for endowments, and money for building and repairing Parsonage Houses, has most humanely and wisely inculcated the important truth, that, as Resident Parish Priests are the most efficient means of extending the civilizing and consolatory principles of Christianity, so the most efficient means of securing a residence beneficial to the parishioners, is to provide for the comforts and respectable maintenance of the Minister.

This conduct is not found on one side only. I might well refer to the Hon. Member for Middlesex, (Mr. BYNG), whom I do not now see in his place opposite. I might, also, refer to the late Duke of Bedford, who, feeling that he inherited large estates derived from Ecclesiastics, held himself in an especial manner bound to make provision for the enlargement of the means of worship in the Establishment to the dwellers on those estates. But I pass on from individuals, whose unconnected exertions may well have failed, when the labours of societies have been utterly unsuccessful.

I have shown how, in the diocese of London,

* Yates's Church in Danger, Letter to the Earl of Liverpool, p. 146.

the Bishop and his Committee have failed in calling forth the voluntary principle to an adequate extent. I could easily show how, in like manner, the voluntary principle, invoked, as it has been, by the Church, in the diocese of Chester, by a prelate of the greatest piety and zeal, following up the labours of the present Bishop of London in that diocese, has also failed. The same result is to be found in the diocese of York. Yet there are not wanting diocesan and local societies in the last named diocese — Bradford, for instance, — Salisbury — Durham, with a branch society at Berwick — Lancashire and Cheshire, — by the aid of which much has been done. In Manchester, large sums have been raised; in Birmingham, 24,000*l.*, with a prospect of increasing it to 40,000*l.*; yet still, all fail in overtaking the demands of a growing population, for whom the nation has neglected to provide the first great element of social life, — religious instruction.

There is one fatal peculiarity in the voluntary principle: it fails exactly where the want is the most urgent. The poor in the poorest places are always the chief sufferers, as I have already stated to the House, in quoting the Liverpool petition. Look at the great manufacturing districts in the North; look at the great mining districts in South Wales; look at the densely-peopled towns every where. Who are those excluded from the means of religious worship? Not the rich, not the educated; but the poor and the ignorant; the poor in proportion to their poverty. How many of the poorest in London are at this moment left unpro-

vided by the voluntary system?—At the lowest estimate, 600,000 souls. How many in Liverpool? —80,000. How many, even with a smaller population, in Sheffield? —80,000.

Dissent, from an Hon. Member (Mr. BAINES).

Does the Hon. Member deny the fact? I can only state that I have received the statement from authority which I believe to be conclusive. The same authority assures me, that, till the Parliamentary Churches were erected in Sheffield, there were not more than 150 free sittings, as they are called, for the poor in the whole parish of Sheffield.

Dissent again, from the same Hon. Member.

This is a point upon which, personally, I can know nothing; but it is confirmed by the terms of a petition signed by nearly four thousand persons, —clergy, bankers, merchants, and other inhabitants of that parish, —and which I have myself had the honour of presenting to the House.*

* Thirty-sixth Report on Public Petitions, p. 395. Sheffield Petition. The Petitioners state that, “ up to 1825, when the first of the new Government Churches was opened, at which time the population of Sheffield amounted to above 60,000 souls, there was absolutely no church accommodation for the poor, save about 100 or 150 sittings in the aisles of St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s Churches!” I have since been informed (and I desire to correct the statements in my speech according to the fact), that the present state of the population of Sheffield, (speaking of the borough,) is this: “ not that 80,000 of the inhabitants are absolutely unprovided for; but that during the long period of all but total neglect referred to in the petition, the irreligious habits of the vast majority were so completely established, that it was then an extremely difficult task to reclaim them; and that, though space is at length partially afforded to them in the new churches, 80,000, at a moderate computation, frequent no place of public worship whatever.”

I am aware that I shall be told (for I have heard of some calculations on the other side of the House upon this subject) that the population of England is so much, and there is room in so many places of religious worship for such a proportion, and, therefore, that there is no great spiritual destitution, taking the whole country together. But, in the first place, what relief is it to a want existing in some densely-peopled manufacturing district, to be told that some church on the mountains of Westmoreland is only half filled : or, to bring the case nearer home, what satisfaction is it to a person — one of the hundreds of thousands, around these very walls, who have no means of spiritual instruction, to be told, that there are empty pews in several churches in the city part of the metropolis ?

And this leads me to another view of the subject, in which, indeed, it has not hitherto been regarded, but in which, as it appears to me, its importance is seen in the strongest light. And I wish, specially, to call the attention of the Noble Lord opposite (Lord J. RUSSELL) to it. My Noble Friend, I assure him, will find it not unworthy of his notice. The strength, then, of my position is this, that neither by the organisation of the Church, nor by the voluntary efforts of dissenters, nor by both, in all their energy, can the extent of the evil of the spiritual destitution of the nation, in its larger and more helpless classes, be adequately met and relieved ; and therefore it is, that I call upon the nation, — I call upon the Noble Lord who in this House

represents the government, and directs the resources of the nation, — to provide national means for relieving a national want and redressing a national evil.

I have already noticed that all the statistics which the House has as yet seen or heard, in reference to the deficiency of church accommodation, and to the consequent duty of church extension, have gone no farther than to show, that in a given district of a given population, there is, in so many churches, room for so many people. But a vital element in the consideration has been omitted. We have never been told, what are the proportions between rich and poor even in that small number so admitted. We have never been told what proportion of the sittings are appropriated to the rich, and what are free to the poor. We have no such return throughout England; but, through the kindness of a Right Reverend Prelate (the BISHOP OF RIPON), in communicating to me the results of his inquiries in his own important diocese, and through the kindness of another individual (Mr. JOWETT) much and usefully employed on this subject, and who has analysed those results, I am enabled to submit to the House some facts which, to myself at least, were equally new and startling. I hold in my hand the returns from the two archdeaconries of Richmond and Craven; in which the parishes are divided into classes, according to the proportion of free sittings, in comparison with the population, found in each: (—as, for instance, in Craven,

twenty-six parishes or districts, with free seats above 200, and not exceeding 300:—) I will not trouble the House with the details. It is sufficient for me to give the last item in the return from each archdeaconry. In Richmond, then, there are thirteen parishes or districts, containing 13,499 souls, WITH NOT ONE FREE SITTING. In the archdeaconry of Craven, there are thirty-five parishes, or districts, containing an aggregate of 181,405 souls, WITH NOT ONE FREE SITTING. I may take the opportunity of adding, that there are forty other parishes or districts in this archdeaconry, with a population amounting to 117,302, in which the average number of free sittings in the churches does not exceed 100, and, in by far the greater part, does not exceed 50: not to notice, that there are several large townships (for instance, in the parishes of Halifax and Bradford) with no church accommodation whatever, and which have not been taken into the above calculation. After this, can we say, that the nation has done its duty? Can we say, that, as Christians, we have done our duty? Can we say, that the distinctive character of Christianity — “to the poor the Gospel is preached” — is exhibited in our land?

THE GOSPEL IS NOT PREACHED TO THE POOR; I say it without reference to churchmen or to dissenters. It ought to be a matter of deep regret to us all, and not of mutual crimination and recrimination. We ought to see in it only a motive of new exertion, and a full justification of an appeal to the nation, to relieve a national want, which all the

zeal and all the energy, alike of churchmen or of dissenters, have failed to supply.

Let it always be borne in mind, that, if the poor have not religious instruction *freely* imparted to them, they have little prospect of obtaining any. They have not leisure to supply for themselves, out of books, that knowledge which the Church ought to provide for them, independently of the want of public worship, and independently of other considerations. If, therefore, the poor are not taught in the Church, they can scarcely ever be taught elsewhere.

Let it not be supposed, as has sometimes been alleged, that the dissenters have taken special and exclusive care of the poor : on the contrary, in a very curious series of papers on the Moral and Ecclesiastical Statistics of London in the *Congregational Magazine*, in an article having particular reference to the borough of the Tower Hamlets, containing a population of 355,816 souls, — after stating that the combined efforts of the whole Christian community have still left destitute of any means of attending public worship no less than 79,679 persons in this district, who from age and circumstances would be capable of attending it, — the writer goes on to observe, “ Now it has been “ the boast of the Wesleyan Methodists ” (whom, I, by the bye, desire not to include as dissenters) “ that they are the missionaries of the poor ; yet, to “ borrow his phrase ” (referring to another writer) “ *in this most congenial soil* they have only sixteen “ places of worship, while the Independents and

“Baptists have sixty-five. But, if the localities of
 “the Independent chapels are marked, their largest
 “and most effective places are not in Bethnal
 “Green, Spitalfields, and the Docks, *but in the more*
 “*respectable parts of the borough*, proving that their
 “strength lies among those who form the strength
 “of the community, — the middle classes.” Here
 it is not a matter of inference, but of assertion
 and boast, that the Independent dissenters have
 not selected the poorer districts for their ministra-
 tions. I make it no matter of blame to them;
 because I believe that it is essentially impossible
 that under the voluntary system it should be
 otherwise. I notice the fact, only to prove that
 the Independents do not at least claim the merit
 of having, by their own voluntary system, endea-
 voured to discharge the duty, which, as I hold,
 the nation owes to its poor.

In fact, all the exertions of all classes of dis-
 senters, — all the exertions even of Whitfield, and
 Wesley, and of the Methodists who have followed
 them, — all the organisation of the Wesleyan system
 itself,—have completely failed to carry any light of
 any kind to hundreds of thousands of our fellow-
 creatures, even in their own country. If this be
 so, what would have been our condition without
 those exertions? How much, above all, does Eng-
 land owe to the Methodists? I may, perhaps, on
 this subject be permitted to quote the words of one
 who has exercised a large influence in this country,
 ALEXANDER KNOX, in whose politics I did not
 always agree, but of the elevation of whose piety I

speak with reverence, and whose testimony on this point, as he was a high churchman, has an additional value: — “What, I ask myself, would this country be, if Methodistic piety were now extinguished throughout its middle and working classes; — if that sense of God, that feeling of inward piety, which raises the soul of humble poverty to a happiness of which mere moral philosophy cannot even catch the idea, were to be swept off and annihilated? Alas! what a precious treasure of heartfelt comfort, of fireside contentment, of steady decent industry, of social virtue, of public order and safety, would go along with it!” *

Let me add, too, on my own part, that I have great reason to believe that the Wesleyan body are very favourable to the object of this motion. One of the earliest petitions which I presented was signed by three Wesleyan ministers in the place where it originated; and at the late anniversary meeting of the body, I have been told that the expressions of regard to the Church of England, and of interest in its extension, were frequent and unequivocal.

I also feel bound to add, that I should do injustice to the dissenters as a body, if I considered that they were identified in principles and in feeling with some of the petitions which particular congregations have been induced to present to this House. On the contrary, their considerate silence is conclusive. Why, if all approved the oppo-

* Knox's Remains, vol. iv. p. 103.

sition of the ministers of the three denominations, why does it happen, that, out of the 408 dissenting congregations in the Metropolis, only 38 have petitioned this House against the object which I now submit to you?—And, therefore, I am entitled to maintain, that, whatever may be the conduct of the political dissenters, the feeling and the principle of many among the dissenters will be the feeling and the principle of their own Matthew Henry, and of their own Doddridge, in reference to the Church Establishment of England.

I do not, therefore, anticipate any extensive or organised opposition to my motion from the great body of the dissenters. Be this as it may, of this I am sure, that, if the object of that motion be good, it can be attained by no effort of the voluntary principle, or by any thing short of an act of the nation. Yet, in stating this conviction, I repeat, that the voluntary principle ought ever to be invoked in aid, to meet national grants, wherever the concurrence is possible, according to the principle upon which chapels are built in places where the Queen has consuls, partly by a grant of public money, and partly by a corresponding subscription on the part of those more immediately and locally interested in the benefit. But in the poorer districts, where the need is greatest, this concurrence is obviously impossible. Yet there are districts, where the population is not rich, but where a very slight assistance will enable them to do great things for themselves. I refer particularly to the plan of the Rev. John Livesey, of Sheffield, for Mechanics'

Churches. I can only allude to it, having already trespassed so long on the time of the House, and having yet to ask much more of their indulgence.

All legislation ought, I think, to be based on the principle that we have no natural inclination for religion or for instruction. There is no natural hunger or thirst for the bread and water of life. Mankind are under no influence by nature to go to church; and, therefore, the doctrine of the demand regulating the supply, however true in respect to the wants of the external man, is utterly inapplicable to his spiritual necessities. Reason and experience confirm the truth, that our need is greatest where our sense of it is the least; and, therefore, according to the memorable sentiment of Chalmers, we must not wait till men go to the church or to the school; the church and the school must go to them. There are, indeed, some remarkable, but rare exceptions; I find such in the zeal which in Upper Canada and Nova Scotia has been shown by parties walking fifteen, twenty, or thirty miles to attend public worship: but, as a general proposition, the truth is unhappily clear, that we must not rely on any tendency in an uneducated man to seek instruction, or in one brought up without the means of worship to know or feel their value.

What is the fact in respect to the myriads of men uneducated and uninstructed in religion throughout the country? Is not their number frightful? Is not their social condition a source

of evil to us all? Look at Monmouthshire and South Wales : —

In Merthyr Tydvil it is computed there are 20,000 chartists. There are but one church and one chapel, capable of holding no more than 2600. Above 23,000 are unprovided for by the church.

In Llanelly is Bryn Mawr, five miles from the church, with a population of 5000,—in a close village, without church, or clergyman. Again, there are Bedwelty, Mynddyswyn, Trevellyn, including Pont-y-pool, with a population, in 1801, of 3635 ; and, at present, of above 30,000 ; the church accommodation not being sufficient for more than between 3000 and 4000, a proportion of not more than one in ten. “ These,” as Mr. Horsfall said, in an excellent speech at Liverpool, “ *These were the parishes, in which the chartists* ” “ who attacked Newport in November, 1839, “ *chiefly resided.*”

The evil has been powerfully stated by the Bishop of Llandaff, both in his late charge, and in his place elsewhere.

But great as the evil is in Wales, and politically great as it has been in its immediate and direct consequences, the evil is not less great in the West Riding of Yorkshire ; and in the other manufacturing districts. The petition from Whalley, to which I have already referred, as presented by my Noble Friend, the Member for North Lancashire (LORD STANLEY), while it states the great and blessed exertions which had been made in that parish, a parish of 98,433 inhabitants, in building

nine new churches there, since 1831, states also that eight others are imperatively wanted.

However extensive may be the need in other places, I doubt, whether, after all, it be greater any where than in a radius of three or four miles from the place in which we are now sitting. I might specially quote the case of the parishes of St. Margaret and St. John the Evangelist. All that the Church Commissioners have said of the general want, applies with pre-eminent force to our own neighbourhood. I quote their Second Report, pp. 6, 7.

“The most prominent, however, of those defects, which cripple the energies of the Established Church, and circumscribe its usefulness, is the want of churches and ministers in the large towns and populous districts of the kingdom. The growth of the population has been so rapid as to outrun the means possessed by the Establishment, of meeting its spiritual wants: and the result has been, that a vast proportion of the people are left destitute of the opportunities of public worship, and Christian instruction, even when every allowance is made for the exertions of those religious bodies, which are not in connexion with the Established Church.

“It is not necessary, in this Report, to enter into all the details, by which the truth of this assertion might be proved. It will be sufficient to state the following facts, as examples. Looking to those parishes only, which contain each a population exceeding 10,000, we find that in London and its suburbs, including the parishes on either bank of the Thames, there are four parishes or districts, each having a population exceeding 20,000, and containing an aggregate of 166,000 persons, with church-room for 8200 (not quite one twentieth of the whole), and only 11 clergymen.

“There are twenty-one others, the aggregate population

of which is 739,000, while the church-room is for 66,155 (not one tenth of the whole), and only 45 clergymen.

“There are nine others, with an aggregate population of 232,000, and church room for 27,327 (not one eighth of the whole), and only 19 clergymen.

“The entire population of these thirty-four parishes amounts to 1,137,000, while there is church-room for only 101,682. Supposing that church-room is required for one third, there ought to be sittings for 379,000 persons. There is, therefore, a deficiency of 277,318 sittings; or, if we allow 25,000 for the number of sittings in proprietary chapels, the deficiency will be 252,318.

“Allowing one church for a population of 3000, there would be required, in these (thirty-four) parishes, 379 churches; whereas there are, in fact, only 69, or, if proprietary chapels be added, about 100, leaving a deficiency of 279; while there are only 139 clergymen, in a population exceeding 1,000,000.”

Similar results were given with respect to the dioceses of Chester, York, and Litchfield and Coventry.

“In the *diocese of Chester*, there are thirty-eight parishes or districts in Lancashire, each with a population exceeding 10,000, containing an aggregate of 816,000 souls, with church room for 97,700, or about one eighth; the proportions varying in the different parishes from one sixth to one twenty-third.”

“In the *diocese of York*, there are twenty parishes or districts, each with a population exceeding 10,000, and with an aggregate of 402,000, while the church accommodation is for 48,000; the proportions varying from one sixth to one thirtieth.”

“In the *diocese of Lichfield and Coventry*, there are sixteen parishes or districts, each having a population above 10,000, the aggregate being 235,000, with church room for about 29,000; the proportions varying from one sixth to one fourteenth.”

Now, who are these Commissioners? Who are those who have addressed such representations to the Crown of England, respecting the spiritual necessities of the people of England? They are not bishops — only, or chiefly: but the present Prime Minister; the present Lord Chancellor; the present Lord President of the Council; the present leader of the government in this House of Parliament.

And do they say that any altered distribution, or improved management of the ecclesiastical income of the country can remedy the evil? On the contrary, they state unequivocally, —

“The resources, which the Established Church possesses, and which can properly be made available to that purpose, in whatever way they may be husbanded or distributed, are evidently quite inadequate to the exigency of the case; and all that we can hope to do is gradually to diminish the intensity of the evil.”

The evil, then, is admitted: the existing resources of the ecclesiastical body, even if they ought primarily to be applied to remedy it, are also admitted to be inadequate to the duty. What then remains? Ought not the government here to have interposed? Ought not the Prime Minister, after having signed such a representation to his Sovereign, to have appealed to the nation, in order to enable him to relieve such a want so urged? On the 5th August last year, he referred, indeed, to this motion, of which I had, even then, given notice. Whether he referred to it with the seriousness which became alike his own position and

the importance of the subject I will not stop to inquire ; but, alluding to different objects of national expenditure, he said that the country must, perhaps, be prepared to make a large grant for relief of the spiritual necessities of the people.

In such a proposal, I contend, that the Noble Lord, to whom I refer, would be more than justified. It is the right of the nation to make such a grant ; it is the duty of the nation to make it. I am equally sure that it is the interest of the nation to make it ; for, as in individuals, so in nations, interest and duty are convertible terms : — whatever it is a man's duty to do, and what it is a nation's duty to do, it is the *interest* of that man and of that nation to do.

There are two governments in the world which are perpetually quoted by some honourable gentlemen opposite, sometimes as models, but never as warnings. One, is the United States of America. Whether the latter owe their favour to the fact of their being the largest specimen of democracy, I will not presume to say. I have already shown that, so far at least as relates to the success of the voluntary system, in that republic, the example of the United States offers no encouragement. The other country is France : whether it owes its favour to its having been the ancient enemy of England, or to its having been a republic forty or fifty years ago, or to its being under “ a liberal government now,” I will not offer an opinion. I admit, indeed, that it has not been so much referred to lately, as ten years ago. But let me remind the

House, that, in respect to the subject of the present motion, the government of France discharges annually and systematically a duty, which, thus far at least, our own government have for many years as systematically neglected. I request the attention of the House, and particularly that of my Right Hon. Friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. F. T. BARING), to the conduct of the government of France, in relation to the spiritual wants of the people. The Right Hon. Gentleman, who brought forward his own budget with so much credit to himself, has probably paid some attention to that of the French Minister of Finance. Is he aware, (if *he* be aware, the people of this country, I suspect, speaking generally, are not aware,) that a very large sum is, in France, annually imposed as a tax, in an actual and regular system of taxation, upon all the people, for the support of religious worship? — I hold in my hand the French budget for 1841. It provides, by formal taxation, a sum of 1,057,000 francs for the bishops of France. It provides, in like manner, a sum of 28,525,000 francs (about 1,122,000*l.*) for the chapters and parochial clergy.* Is the pa-

* I am indebted to the most distinguished foreigner now in England (30th June, 1840,) for the substance of the following note: —

The ecclesiastical parishes of France are not exactly analogous to those of England: they follow the judiciary divisions of the country, it being provided, that, for each district comprehended within the jurisdiction of a justice of the peace, there should be at least one *parish*.

There are at present, in France, cures, 514 of the first class, 2786 of the second class, each with a *curé*.

rochial system of England maintained, to the extent of a single shilling, by taxation? I go on: the French budget contains a sum of 2,400,000 francs (about 96,000*l.*), for the building of churches and parsonage houses: — an annual sum (be it observed) raised by taxation upon the people. The government of France feel their duty. What has been the result? Since 1837 inclusive, 525 new churches have been built and endowed in that country; and in this very budget for 1841, there is a vote for 150 new churches in France.

MR. WARD. But are not all religions supported in France?

The Hon. Member for Sheffield asks me, whether all religions are not equally supported in France? That might be: but that fact would not alter the case: it would, indeed, strengthen it; because it would prove, that, as in France all men are taxed to support all religions, there is no man whose

There are 27,300 succursales, (or districts within parishes,—chapelries, as in Halifax, &c.): — but there are not ministers, (Desservans) to more than 25,500 of these: there are therefore 1800 districts without ministers.

There are altogether 28,800 curés and ministers.

But as, whether there be or be not a minister at the moment to each succursale, a succursale cannot be created, i. e. a commune cannot be erected into a succursale, until a church be built therein, it follows that the number of churches must be equal to the number of cures, and of succursales, together, irrespective of the number of ministers: that is the case: and, consequently, there are 30,000 churches in France.

Whether, or not, there be a parsonage house, i. e. presbytère, the commune always provide a dwelling for their priest, either by giving him a house, or by giving him money to procure one.

conscience is not violated by his being compelled to pay for the support of several forms of faith, all of which, with the exception of his own, he must disapprove.—The items, however, which I have already quoted, are, all, for the support of the Church of Rome, which though no longer a state religion in France, is practically still, in numbers and influence, predominant. It is true, however, that a sum of 890,000 francs goes to the Protestants; and a sum of 96,000 francs goes to the Jews. But the smallness of these sums does not affect the principle: the payment of them might be as great a wound to the conscience of a Roman Catholic, as the payment of the larger sums might be to the Protestant and the Jew. My position is, that, in your favourite France, I can show you, that a liberal government systematically taxes the people for the maintenance of worship, which, by the very instances last quoted, I have proved to be abhorrent to the faith and convictions of others. The particular appropriation in France it is no part of my duty to uphold. I contend, only, first, that, in France, all men are, at this day, taxed for the support of religions to which some of them must be opposed; and I contend, secondly, that, in England, no man is, at this day, taxed at all for the support of the Established Church; no part of the ecclesiastical income of England arises from taxation; and the only tax, or at least the largest tax, which the people of England pay for any religious teaching (they pay a portion towards dissent), is the tax to pay the grant

to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. As to the payments to the Church in the shape of tithes or rent charges, these are no more taxes on the people, than the rents which Hon. Gentlemen on either side of the House receive from their tenants.

On the general subject of contributions by the people to public purposes, I will only say, without entering into the metaphysics either of government, or of property, that, practically, all property is held subject to the will of the supreme power in any nation. It is, therefore, *the right* of the nation, to make provision, out of the national resources, for the national wants. It is the right of the Sultan at Constantinople; it is the right of the King of the French, and the French Chambers; it is the right of the Queen, Lords, and Commons, of England.

It is, further, I contend, *the duty* of the nation, having an Established National Church, to make provision out of the national resources for the increase of that National Church, in proportion to the increase of the people forming that nation. The very meaning of an Established Church being, that it is the recognised and authorised instructress of the people, you mock the people, if you say, that you establish a Church to teach them, and then repel and exclude three fourths of them, without any fault of their own, from the sound of that teaching.

I ask support for that Church, *I* ask it because I believe it to be the truth. *You* ought to grant

it because you have recognised it as such ; because you have established it as such. From the Sovereign on the throne downwards, you have so recognised and established it. The constitution acknowledges it as such. Others may call it “ the Law Church,” — “ the Parliamentary Church,” — (odd terms of reproach from the mouth of those who describe themselves as good subjects ;) I stop only to say that its claims to support are certainly not lessened by the nation having already adopted it. Adopted and established it is ; and it is no longer an open question, as the amendment of which the Hon. Member opposite (Mr. HUME) has given notice, implies, whether we shall, or shall not, have an Established Church. He argues in that amendment, that an Established Church might have been a fitting thing, in those dark ages when all men agreed, or, at least, when all were bound by statutes, to go to one form of worship ; but that, such statutes having been repealed, it was time to withdraw from the Church the pre-eminence which it now enjoys ; and to take away its present supports, instead of adding to them. But I beg to state to the Hon. Member not merely that such pre-eminence is the right of the Church by the existing laws of England ; but that it has higher and inherent claims to our support. The Church is no voluntary association, enunciating hap-hazard opinions. It is a divinely constituted depository of Divine truth. In the Church of England the constitution has enshrined the truth. I ask support for the Church : I ask it

not in reference to the numbers of those who so regard it; though, as its claims are denied because they are those of a minority, I have felt it to be my duty to prove that its claims are upheld by the vast majority of the people of England. I have referred, however, to numbers, not because I regard them as an element of value in my view of the case, but because the argument founded upon numbers, is often popularly brought forward against us; and is, as I believe, as untenable in fact, as it is untenable in principle. In my view of the case, therefore, I repeat that I disregard numbers. Again I say, I ask support for the Church, because it is the truth, and because you have established it as such.

Truth is one; error is multiform. If I am asked, how, with these views, I could ever support the grant to Maynooth, or the Regium Donum; and how I can ever ask any man to support any thing which he, on his part, also, does not regard as truth? my answer is, first, that I never supported those grants, except as legacies left by the parliament of Ireland; and that when that principle was disavowed by this House, by the non-payment of similar legacies to Protestant institutions, I have felt myself at liberty to exercise the same discretion in voting against a grant to a Roman Catholic institution. But I am asked, — Will I not allow a dissenter equally to oppose a vote for a grant to the Church of England? My answer is, of course, that every man, in his legislative character, must act on these subjects, as on all others, according to

his own free but responsible conscience. But in his character of subject, every man, in or out of this House, must pay the taxes imposed by the supreme power of the State, whatever may be their appropriation ; and though I will not voluntarily give any thing individually, from myself, to diffuse error, and will, in this House, oppose any measure which has that tendency, I hold myself bound to pay any tax which the House of Commons, in the legitimate exercise of its parliamentary powers, may think fit to impose for the benefit of the people. I hold dissenters, in like manner, bound to pay their share of any taxation which this House, acting in the same manner for the benefit of the whole nation, may see fit to impose for the support of the Established Church.

There are high and there are low views of the question now before the House. The lowest view, which can be taken of the duty of supporting and extending the Church, is, that religion is the cheapest and most effective police.

I will not disregard even this consideration. I contend, then, that it is not only the right of the supreme power of the State to require from all its subjects this support of the Church ; that it is not only its duty to require that support as support of the truth, but that, even in the lowest sense, it is likewise the interest of the nation. It is the interest of the nation to take care that the people be well instructed in their duty to God ; and, therein, well affected in the discharge of their duty towards men.

The Church is the most effectual restraint upon crime : and a well-administered parochial superintendence is the most complete and efficient police of any country. I need hardly remind any gentleman, that the dying testimony of criminals continually refers to “ Sabbath-breaking and neglect of “ church ” as the commencement of their course of evil ; the first step in guilt of more than half their numbers. The observation of Collins, of Glasgow, is remarkable : — “ The truth is, the people will cost “ us [something], whether we will, or not. If we “ do not build them churches, we must build them “ gaols and bridewells. If we will not suffer to be “ taxed for their religious instruction, we must suffer “ to be taxed for the punishment and repression of “ their crimes. From this the Dissenters can no “ more escape than Churchmen.”* The House will hardly believe the amount which England has paid since the commencement of the present century in building and repairing gaols. In six counties, the aggregate expense has been more than a million and a half : in all England, from 1800 to 1830, it exceeds 3,320,000*l*. I do not suppose, or mean to insinuate, that an increase of church accommodation in the interval would have superseded the necessity of all this expenditure ; but I do mean to say, that, exactly in proportion to the degree of active and pious pastoral superintendence, is, humanly speaking, the certainty of the diminution of the amount of crime, and consequently of the

* Collins’s Statistics of the Church Accommodation of Glasgow, &c., p. 50.

expense of punishment. There are some very important facts on this subject, which I find in the same work of Collins, which I have already quoted. — Will the House indulge me by listening to them?

“By an examination of our statistics, and of the survey of the parochial agents, we find that in the Goosedubs, Bridegate, Old and New Wynds, Salt Market, Old and New Vennals, Havannah, Dempster Street, and the poor districts of Gorbals and Calton, the people only possess church accommodation in the proportion of $2\frac{1}{4}$, $2\frac{3}{4}$, 5, 8, or 11, in the 100. And from positive and personal inquiry, we can state, on the authority of the Captain of the Police and the Magistrates on the one hand, and of the Governor and Chaplain of Bridewell on the other, that *nearly all* the criminals who are tried by the one, or are immured in the other, come from those very places we have just enumerated, where the people are so destitute of church accommodation; while from those quarters of the city where the people possess church accommodation in the proportion of 50, 60, 70, or 80, in the 100, the police officer has no criminals, and Bridewell has no inmates. These experimental facts clearly indicate the relative power and influence of the fear of God and the fear of man — the instruction of the Church and the coercion of Bridewell, in securing the peace and order of society.”

As an illustration of the same principle, I have the authority of an eminent judge (BARON GURNEY), for stating that “when he was going the Norfolk circuit in 1832, a magistrate of Suffolk said to him, in the course of a conversation respecting the prisoners for trial, that he could go over the map of the county, and show that there was hardly a prisoner in the calendar, who did not come from

a parish without a resident clergyman and resident squire."

No education is, of course, a preventive of crime; but I may add, that of fifty-two educated persons, who, at a given period, were found in Newgate, six only were educated by the Church, eighteen by dissenters: considering the excess of actual numbers belonging to the Church, the small proportion of those whom the Church had educated being found in Newgate, is some presumption (I put it no higher), that there is generally a more fundamental inculcation of right principle, in such training.

But the extension of the Church is not merely a measure of police, preventing crime; but a measure (I am looking, for the moment, to secular objects only) promoting good: the Church is the most effectual agent in the distribution of temporal blessings; and becomes, in every district, the centre of benevolent action. The House will allow me to prove this by some examples within this metropolis.

The church of St. Peter's, Mile End, Stepney, was consecrated on the 16th of August, 1838, for a congregation of about 1400 persons, in a population of about 6000. Five sixths of the pay-seats are already let; and the attendance in the free seats is generally good. (I quote from a return made to the Bishop of the diocese.) The incumbent, the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON, states, that three fourths of the congregation never, before the erection of this edifice, went to church with any

regularity of habit ; and there was no previous pastoral superintendence, and no societies for Christian (I mean, religious) objects : — And now to the results, which have followed the planting a church and a minister in this district. There have been formed an association auxiliary to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge ; another, to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, by which the promoters expect to raise 80*l.* for the parent society ; a Lord's-Day-Observance Society ; a District-visiting Society, by which every house in the district is to be visited ; a lying-in charity ; two large schools, for 500 children ; the average attendance in which, is, boys, 306, — girls, 153 ; a Sunday school attended by 572 children. There have been raised in this district, in public charities, for these and other objects, 1167*l.* ; besides about 150*l.* contributed by the children for their own education. There has been likewise formed, a Lending Library, with about 570 volumes. Before the erection of the church, there were one Wesleyan, and one dissenting chapel ; but the institutions, to which I have referred, have all been the consequence of the foundation of the district church. The Rev. THOMAS JACKSON, who has supplied these particulars, adds, — “ The poor in my
 “ neighbourhood are respectful, I had almost said,
 “ affectionate. They only want the ministrations of
 “ more clergymen. My preaching and presence
 “ necessarily create a demand among them for more
 “ pastoral instruction.” I well remember my excellent friend, the Rev. JOHN VENN, now in Here-

ford, telling me, that his pastoral visits, when he had a cure of souls in one of the worst parts of London, though received at first with surprise, were received with gratitude and affection which he never saw exceeded any where.

Again, what has been done by the two Wilsons, in the parish of Islington? — I have the honour of referring to both of them as my friends.

When the Rev. DANIEL WILSON, now Bishop of Calcutta, was first appointed Vicar of Islington, there were one Church, and one Chapel of Ease, in that parish. This was thirteen years ago. His son is now vicar. During the incumbency of the two, seven new churches have been built at an expense of 50,000*l.*, of which a large part was raised by voluntary subscription in the parish; the rest was from the parliamentary grant, and the Society for Churches. The immediate effect has been, twelve new schools for 2000 children. A district of 3000 or 4000 souls, has been assigned to each new church. The whole of the poor population, about 16,000, is regularly reached by voluntary agents under the direction of the parochial clergy; about 6000 visits being paid monthly. And as to public charities; the sums raised in the parish, for religious and benevolent objects, amount to between 5000*l.* and 6000*l.* per annum.

One more illustration of the merely secular change produced by the organisation of the Church, I will give in the words of one widely known and justly esteemed in this metropolis, the Rev. THOS. DALE. I quote from his speech at the great meet-

ing held last year in London to promote the object of Church Extension. He is speaking of the temporal benefits which followed the erection of a new church. He says —

“In the neighbourhood of this new church, a gentleman, who discharged the duties of a Christian visiter, and had under his superintendence about thirteen families before the erection of the new church, found, out of the thirteen, three only who were in the habit of attending the public worship of God. Within less than twelve months after the opening of the new church, the proportion was exactly reversed ; and at this very moment, out of the thirteen, there are only three who do not attend on the public services of the Church.

“Though the amount of temporal relief distributed among these thirteen families is now not one fourth of what it formerly was, yet the visiter is more cheerfully and cordially received than ever he was before.”

I believe that I may state, as one result of the erection of the churches hitherto built by parliamentary aid, that a school has almost invariably followed a church.

I lower, however, the principle, on which I ask for the support of the House to the motion, which I now bring before you, if I rest on these results. It is the interest of the nation to support the Church, not only as preventing evil, not only as promoting good in secular and temporal things, but as promoting good in the highest and spiritual sense. If a whole nation were taught of God,

how blessed would they be! — how blessed would their rulers be! — what a change would there be even in the affairs of this world! — and how surely, in proportion to the diffusion of Christian principles, is the measure of the result attained! But how far more blessed would such a people be, in reference to that eternal world, to which we are all hastening! I cannot pursue this subject: I will only ask any one, opposite, or around me, to consider the actual state of ignorance and of sin, in which hundreds of thousands, whom we have never taught, are compelled to live; — and, then, add one other question, — how many of those myriads, thus left without the means of Christian instruction and Christian worship, die every day?

These are the men, who fill your gaols: many of these are the men, who are witnesses in your courts of justice; yet, on their testimony, depend the life and the property of others, — perhaps the property and life of yourselves, — when you put into their hands a book, of the contents of which they know nothing, and call upon them to swear by the help of God, whose worship and whose word you have, alike, kept from them. Can we hope for the blessing of God on such a state of things, in a country which we call Christian?

With such considerations before me, I unhesitatingly assert, in reference to the spiritual destitution of our country, and all its consequences, that it is the duty of all men to make efforts, voluntarily, as individuals, and to concur cheerfully in the efforts which may be made by the nation, to relieve

and remove that destitution. But, while this is the common duty of all, it is the special duty of those who derive their wealth from the labours of those very classes in which the destitution and all its results are almost exclusively found. There is a beautiful passage in a work by my friend Mr. Henry Wilberforce*, which well expresses my feelings and my views : —

“ There are hundreds among us, who have made
 “ fortunes as manufacturers. How does the case
 “ stand with them? They have set up a factory, it
 “ may be, in some sequestered spot, where a village
 “ has immediately arisen. The population has in-
 “ creased from year to year; the capital of the
 “ manufacturer has increased with it; his works
 “ have been extended; new labourers have arrived;
 “ and, in the evening of his days, he retires with a
 “ handsome property, honourably gained; and it is
 “ his joy that he owes nothing to any man. But
 “ is this indeed the case? He has paid his la-
 “ bourers for their time, and their strength; but
 “ how has he remunerated them for their souls?
 “ He invited them from their country villages, from
 “ their homes, and the church of their fathers; he
 “ allured their children from school to his factory;
 “ and what has he given them instead? Has he not
 “ too often left them in a situation of peculiar
 “ danger and temptation; without a church, with-
 “ out a pastor, without a school? Can he acquit
 “ himself of having grown rich upon the ruin of
 “ immortal souls?”

* “ Parochial System,” by the Rev. H. W. Wilberforce.

I do not accuse all the great manufacturers or miners of England of having neglected this solemn duty which they owe to the producers of their wealth. There are exceptions not only in the case of individuals, but, which is rarer, in the case even of public bodies. I refer with pleasure to the conduct of the Rhymney Iron Company, in the Bill which they brought into this House, last year, for the purpose of enabling them to build a church for the people whom their works had brought together on a desolate mountain. I refer with pleasure, also, to the Bill, which passed an important stage yesterday in this House, the Weaver Churches Bill, founded on the same principle, and tending to the same end. I will only add, that we very imperfectly discharge our duties to those who are placed beneath us in society, if we are satisfied with paying them their daily wages, when we have placed them in situations of temptation, or have systematically left them and their children without the means of instruction and public worship.

I have shown the inadequacy of voluntary efforts, taken singly, to relieve the spiritual wants of the nation ; much more to keep up the supply to the level of the need, in the augmented and augmenting population of England. I might urge, too, the unfairness of transferring a national obligation from the nation to the purses of the benevolent and the pious. The benevolent and the pious are not the only persons whose interests are bound up with the morality of the people.

It is the duty of the Government, therefore, to

supply the deficiency. The Government of 1818 recognised this duty, and proposed the million grant. The Parliament of 1818 acknowledged the duty; and passed the grant, unanimously; the Hon. Member opposite (Mr. HUME) being, nevertheless, in his place. The Government of this day ought to have proposed a grant. Almost every individual member of the Cabinet is committed to the principle of a grant. What, in 1824, said the Right Hon. Baronet, now the President of the India Board? I quote the words of Mr. HOBHOUSE on the 9th of April, 1824* : — “ If “ the fact really was that any deficiency existed in “ the country in the means of obtaining accommo- “ dation for religious worship, he was sure that it “ was impossible that any Honourable Gentleman “ could be found, who would not assist His Ma- “ jesty’s Government to the utmost of his power “ in devising a method of supplying that de- “ ficiency.”

What, on the same occasion, said his now colleague, the Noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (LORD PALMERSTON)?† — “ It was “ his wish that the Established Church should be “ the predominant one in this country — if they “ denied to the people the means of attending “ divine worship according to the practice of the “ Established Church, how could they expect that “ the members of the Establishment would con- “ tinue to increase? ”

* See Hansard, vol. xi. New Series, p. 330.

† See Hansard, vol. xi. New Series, p. 359.

The Noble Lord, the Member for Northumberland (LORD HOWICK), not now, indeed, a member of the Cabinet, said, in my hearing, on the 3d of March, 1837, when I took down his words : — “ I “ profess, in the very strongest language which I “ can use, my resistance to the voluntary prin- “ ciple.”

My noble friend, the Secretary of State for the Colonies (LORD J. RUSSELL), in a memorable speech, at the commencement of the present session, on the case of John Thorogood, said, in the name of the nation, — “ The principle, on which “ alone they could maintain the Established Church, “ was that it was for the common good ; and *that* “ was a principle which entitled them to ask for that “ burden to be laid on all. He did not think that “ those who had to maintain the doctrines of the “ Church from the pulpits of the Establishment of “ this country ought to be left to the contributions “ of the people for their support.”

But he stated my whole case more fully, more philosophically, and more eloquently in his speech on moving the augmentation of the army, on the 2d of August, 1839. I must be permitted to strengthen my appeal to the House by quoting his words : — “ We have, particularly in the manufac- “ turing districts, very large masses of people, who “ have grown up in a state of society, which it is “ both lamentable and appalling to contemplate. “ They have not grown up amidst the usual conco- “ mitants of an ordinary state of society, under the “ hand of early instruction ; with places of worship

“to attend; with their opinions of property moulded
 “by seeing it devoted to social and charitable ob-
 “jects; and with a fair and gradual subordination
 “of ranks. But it is in many cases a society neces-
 “sarily composed of the working classes, with a few
 “persons who employ their labour, but with whom
 “they have little other connection; and, unhappily,
 “neither receiving in schools nor in places of wor-
 “ship, that religious and moral instruction, which
 “is necessary to knit together the inhabitants and
 “classes of a great country.”

My Noble Friend has not receded from these
 principles. Last night the House heard the Noble
 Lord refer (in words which I took down at the
 moment) to the “great population grown up, to
 “which the Church of England has not the means
 “of bringing her organised instruction.” With
 equal truth and force, he stated, “In so far as
 “you increase the means of religious instruction
 “throughout the country, (which, hitherto, volun-
 “tary efforts have not succeeded in meeting,) you
 “strengthen the bonds of all social relations, you
 “strengthen the attachment of the people to their
 “Sovereign, and the attachment of fellow-subjects
 “to each other.”

I have proved by these references that the lead-
 ing members of the present Government in this
 House are pledged to the principle which I advo-
 cate, — the principle of extending the ministrations
 of the Church in proportion to the needs of the
 people. I call upon the House to affirm the same
 principle. I am aware that I shall be met, even if

successful, by a very considerable minority ; but I know that a large majority of the members in this House, after all the changes which have taken place, are still members of the Established Church ; I know that a large majority of the people of England are attached to the Church ; I know that their attachment is deepening and widening ; I know that the Church possesses a just and justly-increasing influence in this country ; and, with my full and solemn conviction of the importance of the measure which I propose, in reference to every interest of the country, I feel assured of ultimate success.

But I ask the House at present only to affirm the principle that it is the duty of a nation calling itself Christian, to make provision for the Christian instruction of the people.

Admit this principle by your vote to-night : leave to the Government the application of that principle ; whether by building churches ; by endowing churches, (and here let me add my own strong opinion, that, unless endowed, churches are of comparatively little value*,) and if in endowing churches, whether, as one mode of endowment, by buying up and annexing impropriations† ; by increasing the number of services in churches‡ ; by new and special arrangements, in respect to

* See 4th Report of the Diocesan Society for Manchester and Cheshire, p. 17—19.

† See Church Extension, by the Rev. W. W. Malet.

‡ Christchurch, in Liverpool, has a third service—for the poor exclusively. I doubt that principle.

pews, and the principle of pewing, in the new churches ; by aiding missionary ministers ; by all, or any of these modes ; by any fixed, or any varying proportion of aid, to be given by the nation, compared to the fund to be provided by the locality : all these I leave to the Government.

I would only suggest such provisions and cautions as these : that the statutes of mortmain ought to be repealed : they were enacted on the ground that private liberality was doing too much for the Church ; and that it was necessary to restrain it. [My Honourable Friend the Member for Newark, has already made this suggestion* : no one can say that the excess is now on that side.] That Government ought to provide a site for a church wherever, on Crown land, a mass of 500 houses shall be built : that, by some general provision, (such a clause, for instance, as now secures in every inclosure-bill an open space for the poor,) a church shall be built, whenever, on other land than the land of the Crown, a similar mass of houses shall be built : look at the new towns rising up at the Railway-stations, without any apparent thought, or care, for any means of religious worship and instruction to the masses there attracted :—let me add, that, if no houses were built at the moment, a church would often attract them ; let me add, also, that a grant of land for a church seldom, if ever, costs any thing ; the erection of the church increasing the value of the adjacent land. I have

* Gladstone's Church and State, p. 71.

not time to suggest more than two other cautions ; —one, that, in no case, ought pew-rents to provide for the income of the minister ; the other, that, if the present parochial divisions of the country, (which, in the manufacturing districts, are generally enormous in area, and, in the great towns, overwhelmingly populous,) cannot be altered, a district at least ought to be assigned to every new church, “ with the right (to repeat the words of the venerable incumbent of Liversedge, whose memorial I have already quoted) to have the doctrines, services and sacraments of Christ as fully, regularly, and duly administered, as in any Parish Church in the realm.” *

I do not ask the House to affirm any one of these details. I ask their support to the principle : leaving to the Government, not merely the application of the principle, but the pecuniary amount to be employed in carrying forth that principle. Let the Government, with their means of knowledge,

* “ Upon the apportioning of resident Clergy, according to the number of inhabitants, and not according to the pecuniary produce, or the superficial surface of parishes, depend all the advantages of an Established Church in regard to religious instruction and good government.” * * * *

“ For, in fact, the most dangerous haunts of vice, that spread their destructive contagion far beyond their own limits, are to be found in those overgrown and uncontrollable accumulations of uninstructed human beings, where the letter of the Residence Acts is complied with, but where one resident Curate, and one set of Parish Officers, have the nominal charge of duties, which, to perform, is a natural impossibility, and which, in other parts of the country, are intrusted to forty or fifty resident ministers, and as many sets of Parish Officers.” — *Yates's Church in Danger*, p. 133.

and on their own responsibility, bring down a message from the Crown, or introduce a Bill calling upon us, specifically, to discharge our personal and national responsibility.

Who then are the opponents of a grant? The Papist and the Dissenter, in unholy alliance with the Infidel and the Socialist; the Papist, who, to this day, tolerates no other worship than his own in some of the chief states of the Continent, and the Dissenter, whose war-cry is religious liberty. Unlike the Romanist of a former age, who, referring to the 50 churches of Queen Anne's reign, says, (in no irony, as to the object, whatever he may have thought of the architecture,)

“ Bid temples worthier of their God ascend :”—

unlike the Dissenter of a former age, who, looking at the village churches scattered over England, exclaimed,

“ These temples of our God
How beautiful they stand !
The glories of our native plains,
The bulwarks of our land.”

I could quote many instances of dissenters in the last century, who regarded the Church with very different feelings from some of their successors in the present day. I might refer specially to Matthew Henry, and to Doddridge, for proofs of the general respect which they showed to the Church. Matthew Henry's defence of Church-rates I have quoted on another occasion.* At this moment,

* The whole commentary of Matthew Henry on St. Matthew,

indeed, as I have already observed, there are large bodies of dissenters, who adhere to the feelings and principles of Henry and of Doddridge, and who abstain from this war against the Church: and many of whose efforts to supply our lack of service I regard with respect. But the political dissenters are now like their predecessors two centuries ago: and now, again, there are united in unhallowed confederacy against us, all those who hate the church as the barrier of orthodoxy, and all those who hate it as the barrier of the monarchy. They alike dread the efficiency of The Church: they alike know that the influence of the Church of England upon the people of England is deepening and widening; and they will take every measure to prevent that Church being extended, either by her own energies or by the aid of the wisdom and power of Parliament.

xviii. 24—27. is excellent. I recommend one passage in particular to the Anti-Church-Rate-Society, and to the Ministers of the Dissenters of the Three Denominations, who met on the 6th March, 1840:—"Of contributing to the public worship of God in the places where we are." He is referring to the tribute-money demanded of our Lord. He says the tribute demanded was not any civil payment to the Roman powers, but the church duties, which was required from every person for the service of the temple:—"The temple was now made a den of thieves, and the temple worship a pretence for the opposition which the chief priests gave to Christ and his doctrine; and yet Christ paid this tribute. *Note.* Church duties, legally imposed, are to be paid, notwithstanding church corruptions. We must take care not to use 'our liberty as a cloak of covetousness or maliciousness,' 1 Peter, ii. 16. If Christ pay tribute, who can pretend an exemption?"

Yield to them, and refuse the grant : — You consign millions to involuntary ignorance, to forced atheism : you cannot deny that such is at this moment the fact, the awful state of hundreds of thousands ; you cannot deny that such will be still more the fact, every year of your delay. For this state of things, some are, some must be, responsible. There can be no great national mis-doing, or national neglect, without some responsible being, on whom it will be charged.

Looking even at this world, see what is the consequence of ignorance and atheism, combined with physical force : will not vice and turbulence be the consequences ? can you *yourselves* be exempt from the effects of that vice and of that turbulence ?

In no country in the world is there such wealth in such immediate juxta-position with such poverty. In no country, therefore, is it so important for the rulers and the rich, *even on selfish* principles, to elevate poverty by piety ; to disarm physical force by religion ; to take care that those, who are below them, are taught their duty to God and to man, and not merely reading and writing, which, without better teaching, will only make man a more accomplished instrument of evil. Does any one deny this ? Does any one say that a knowledge of arithmetic will teach a boy not to covet ; that a knowledge of the arts of design will indispose a man to forgery ?

I was reading this day one of the reports of the chaplain of Clerkenwell prison. His experience

confirms the proposition that education, meaning, as it too often means, merely intellectual cultivation, will produce no moral benefit, and, therefore, no social benefit. He states, that some of the most remarkable criminals, who had been committed to his prison, were persons who had all received this intellectual training, Sullivan and Jordan, Greenacre, and the Cato-Street conspirators, &c. But even a religious education is not enough. It is not enough to instil Christian principles into the boy, and then, at the age of sixteen, at the most critical period of his life, when his passions are the strongest, to throw him off from the restraints of the school, without giving him the restraints of the church; and to leave him in this great metropolis in a forced and necessary exclusion from public worship, and religious instruction. He, and all such, have a right to call upon their country for protection in these their highest interests. And it is your own interest and your social safety to grant it.

I have heard elsewhere, and I shall perhaps hear to-night, as an unanswerable argument against my motion, that the nation cannot afford to make the grant which I require; that the grants in 1818 and 1824 were in seasons of great financial prosperity; that I ought to wait till such return; and not select a year when the revenue is decreasing, and the public expenditure is already necessarily increased. My reply is brief:—An individual ought to reduce his expences to the level of his income; a nation ought to raise its income to the level of its duties. If, as I contend, the measure

which I propose, be the discharge of a national obligation, the nation ought to find in itself the means of meeting it. And how easily might those means be found?—What have been the amount of war-taxes remitted to the people in the last twenty-five years, during which, by God's Providence, we have been blest with peace? My object will require a small proportion only of the wealth which has been so returned to the people.

(Dissent from Mr. O'CONNELL.)

The phrase is wrong,—"returned to the people:" but will any one deny that vast sums have been left in the pockets of the people, which, if the war-taxes, aye, and other taxes not of that class, had not been repealed, would have been paid by the people, and which not having been paid, have left them in a condition to make, (without sacrifice, at least with little sacrifice at the moment, and with none, looking at the whole case,) such a grant as the exigency of the spiritual destitution of the country requires? Why, the war duty on malt alone, if continued to this day, would have drawn 38,580,000*l.* from the people; and the property tax, which was repealed in 1816, would, if continued to 1840, have taken from the people the enormous sum of 350,827,752*l.*

Affirm, then, the principle that it is your duty to make the grant. You do your part in endeavouring to rescue millions of souls, the souls of your fellow countrymen; and at what price? Think of what is spent by the country in the slow poison of spirits; think what was the amount of

your subsidies to foreign powers, in one year, the last year of the last war ; think what you granted cheerfully to redeem the bodies of the slaves in your colonies.

Is it our duty, as individuals, to do good to the souls of others? Does that cease to be our duty when we enter these walls? Can it be matter of indifference before God, — what we do as having power and responsibility in this House? He has long blessed us; He has long spared us. The civil and social blessings of England are unexampled: our wealth exceeds that of any other people: our duties are in proportion to our means. We see the state of almost heathen ignorance, in which, notwithstanding our own light and knowledge, we suffer myriads of our own people to live and to die. If having received this warning, we neglect it, — if we suffer these myriads so to live and so to die, a heavy responsibility is upon us. “IT MUST NEEDS BE THAT OFFENCES COME; BUT WOE TO THAT MAN, BY WHOM THE OFFENCE COMETH. IT WERE BETTER FOR THAT MAN THAT A MILL-STONE WERE HANGED ABOUT HIS NECK, AND HE CAST INTO THE SEA, THAN THAT HE SHOULD OFFEND ONE OF THESE LITTLE ONES.” We do offend these little ones, if, having the means of enlightening them, we leave them to stumble on in darkness. In the words of Dr. Johnson, I say, “If obedience to the will of God be necessary to happiness, and knowledge of His will be necessary to obedience, I know not, how he, that withholds this knowledge, or delays it, can be said to love his

“neighbour as himself. He that voluntarily conti-
 “nues in ignorance is guilty of all the crimes which
 “ignorance produces; as to him that should extin-
 “guish the tapers of a lighthouse, might justly be
 “imputed the calamities of shipwreck. Christianity
 “is the highest perfection of humanity; and as no
 “man is good but as he wishes the good of others,
 “no man can be good in the highest degree, who
 “wishes not to others the largest measures of the
 “greatest good. To omit for a year or for a day, the
 “most efficacious method of advancing Christianity,
 “in compliance with any purposes that terminate
 “on this side of the grave, is a crime of which I
 “know not that the world has yet had an example
 “except in the practice of the planters of America,
 “a race of mortals whom, I suppose, no other man
 “wishes to resemble.”*

I most cordially thank the House for their long
 patience with me; and I now move the resolution
 of which I gave notice:

Sir Robert Harry Inglis then moved, that, on Wed-
 nesday, the 17th of July, this House will re-
 solve itself into a Committee of the whole
 House, to consider of the following Address
 to Her Majesty, that is to say, That an humble
 Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying
 that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased
 to take into consideration the deficiency which
 exists in the number of places of worship be-

* Johnson's Letter to Drummond, Boswell's Johnson, by
 Croker, vol. ii. p. 27.

longing to The Established Church when compared with the increased and increasing population of the Country, the inadequate provision therein for the accommodation of the poorer classes in large towns, and the insufficient endowment thereof in other places, as such facts have been severally set forth in the Reports of the late Ecclesiastical Commissioners; to assure Her Majesty, that this House is deeply impressed with a just sense of the many blessings which this Country, by the favour of Divine Providence, has long enjoyed, and with the conviction, that the religious and moral habits of the People are the most sure and firm foundation of national prosperity; to state to Her Majesty the opinion of this House, that no altered distribution of the revenues of the Established Church could remove the existing and augmenting evil, arising from the notorious fact, that an addition of more than six million souls has been made to the population of England and Wales since the commencement of the present century, and that the rate of this increase is rapidly progressive; that the grants made by the wisdom of Parliament, on the recommendation of the Crown, in 1818 and 1824, have been inadequate to supply the national wants; and that, though private and local liberality has been largely manifested in aid of particular districts, the greatest wants exist where there are the least means to meet and relieve them;

to assure Her Majesty that this House, feeling that God has intrusted to this nation unexampled resources, is satisfied, that it is the duty of the Government to employ an adequate portion of the wealth of the nation to relieve the spiritual destitution of large masses of the people, by whose labour that wealth has been enlarged; and humbly to represent to Her Majesty, that this House will cheerfully make good such measures as Her Majesty may be pleased to recommend, in order to provide for Her people in England and Wales further and full means of religious worship and instruction in the Established Church.

THE END.

LONDON:

Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-Street-Square.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

MAR 20 1967 9

RECEIVED

MAR 5 '67-1 PM

LOAN DEPT.

MAY 1 1969 48

FEB 07 1997

REC. MOFFITT NOV 14 '9

RECEIVED

APR 17 '69-3 PM

LOAN DEPT.

MAY 21 1969 09

REC'D LD JUN 6 '69-3 PM

NOV 13 1970 04

REC'D LD OCT 3 070 -12AM 8

LD 21A-60m-7,'66
(G4427s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C057938897

871786

AC1
M5
v.7
**

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

